LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BR 85 .S82 1888
Strong, Augustus Hopkins,
1836-1921.
Philosophy and religion

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

A

SERIES OF ADDRESSES, ESSAYS AND SERMONS

DESIGNED TO SET FORTH GREAT TRUTHS

IN POPULAR FORM

BY

AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG, D. D.

PRESIDENT AND PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN THE

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

NEW YORK

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON

714 BROADWAY

1888

COPYRIGHT,
BY AUGUSTUS HOPKINS STRONG,
1888.

PRINTED BY
EZRA R. ANDREWS,
ROCHESTER, N. Y.

TO

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, Esq.,

THE FRIEND AND HELPER OF EVERY GOOD CAUSE,

THROUGH WHOSE LIBERALITY THE AUTHOR IS ENABLED

TO PUT THESE ESSAYS INTO PRINT,

THE VOLUME IS GRATEFULLY

INSCRIBED.

PREFACE.

This book is printed by way of testimony. It is a confession of faith — a long one indeed, yet none the less sincere. The author can say: "I believed, — therefore have I spoken." In this day when skepticism is so rife, and when even Christian teachers so frequently pride themselves that they believe, not so much, but so little, it seems to him that nothing is more needed than uncompromising assertion of faith in the existence of God, the world, and the soul. "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" For himself, and for more than seven thousand others who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of brute force and impersonal law, the author desires to answer in the affirmative.

The volume takes its title from the first Essay, — and the title is fairly descriptive of the book. It aims to present truth in popular form; most of the Essays contained in it have been written for public address; some of them date back to a time when the author's rhetoric was more exuberant than now, — for all this he makes no apology. He would fain hope that what Fox said of Burke's exuberance of fancy may be counted true of himself: "Reduce his language, withdraw his images, — and you will find that he is more wise than eloquent; you will have your full weight of metal, though you melt down the chasing." Yet, if any reader still demand abstract statement instead of the oratorical method, the author takes the liberty of referring him to the "Systematic Theology" of which this is the companion-volume, where he will find much of the same truth put in more philosophical form.

It needs to be stated, however, that much of the present book is new, or at least has never before appeared in print. The Essays on

"Modern Idealism" and on "The New Theology," on "Dante and the Divine Comedy," and on "Poetry and Robert Browning," have been written for this volume. The author has included in it certain tributes to the memory of the dead, not only because the departed were his friends, but because in speaking of them he could also express his views of the work they sought to do. The personal element is not wholly lacking,—in many cases its elimination would have required the entire reconstruction of the discourse,—in general, the author would have the several addresses judged in the light of the special occasions for which they were prepared.

The author would disclaim any expectation that his book will be widely read. It is not published at the request of friends,—indeed, the author is not aware that any friends desire to read what he has written. His chief aim has been to put himself on record. If any choose to read, well,—here is opportunity for the curious investigator to say: "*Sic cogitavit.*" But if none choose to read, it is also well,—the author, at least, has delivered his soul. He commits his work to God and to his providence—sowing his seed and withholding not his hand, though he knows not which shall prosper, whether this or that. He prays that his errors, if he has erred, may be uprooted and exposed; and that any truth he has discovered or uttered may somewhere, and at some time, be made fruitful for good. But, whatever may befall him or his work, Christo Deo Gloria, Salvatori Omnipotenti!

It remains only to say that the author's grateful acknowledgements are due to the Reverend Robert Kerr Eccles, M. D., of Salem, Ohio, for the care and faithfulness which he has shown in correcting errors of the press and in preparing the Index. It is certain that in this case, as in the case of the author's Systematic Theology, every thoughtful reader will regard himself as Dr. Eccles's debtor.

Rochester Theological Seminary,
Rochester, April 1, 1888.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

I.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION,

An Address before the Alumni of the Rochester Theological Seminary, at their annual meeting, May 20th, 1868, and printed in the Baptist Quarterly, 2 : 393 *sq.*, ... 1–18

II.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION,

An Address delivered at the Commencement of the Medical College, Cleveland, Ohio, February 18, 1867, ... 19–30

III.

MATERIALISTIC SKEPTICISM,

An Essay printed in the Examiner, New York, October 2, 1873, ... 31–38

IV.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVOLUTION,

An Address delivered before the Literary Societies of Colby University, Waterville, Maine, Tuesday evening, July 23, 1878, ... 39–57

V.

MODERN IDEALISM,

Printed in the Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1888, ... 58–74

VI.

SCIENTIFIC THEISM,

An Essay read before "The Club," Rochester, February 16, 1875, ... 75–89

VII.

THE WILL IN THEOLOGY,

OR, AN EARLIER VIEW OF THE WILL,

Printed in the Baptist Review, 1880 : 527–550, and 1881 : 30–47, ... 90–113

VIII.

MODIFIED CALVINISM,

OR, REMAINDERS OF FREEDOM IN MAN,

Printed in the Baptist Review, April, 1883, ... 114–128

IX.

THE CHRISTIAN MIRACLES,

OR, MIRACLES AS ATTESTING A DIVINE REVELATION,

An Essay read before the Baptist Pastors' Conference of the State of New York, Binghampton, October 23, 1878, and printed in the Baptist Review, April, 1879, ... 129–147

X.

THE METHOD OF INSPIRATION,

Printed in the Examiner, New York, October 7, and October 14, 1880, 148–155

XI.

CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALISM,

Preached at Vassar College, February 28, 1886, as a Sermon on the text, John 21 : 21, 22—"What shall this man do? . . . . What is that to thee? Follow thou me," 156–163

XII.

THE NEW THEOLOGY,

Printed in the Baptist Quarterly Review, January, 1888, ... 164–179

XIII.

THE LIVING GOD,

Originally prepared as a Sermon upon the text, Jer. 10 : 10—"The Lord is the true God; he is the living God, and an everlasting King," 180–187

XIV.

THE HOLINESS OF GOD,

Originally prepared as a Sermon upon the text, Ex. 15 : 11—"Glorious in holiness," and preached in the Chapel of the University of Rochester, on the Day of Prayer for Colleges, January 31, 1878; subsequently printed as an article in the Examiner, January 26, February 9, and February 22, 1882, ... 188–200

XV.

THE TWO NATURES OF CHRIST,

Preached in Sage Chapel, Cornell University, May 25, 1884, as a Sermon on the text, Matt. 22 : 42—"What think ye of the Christ? Whose son is he?" 201–212

XVI.

THE NECESSITY OF THE ATONEMENT,

A Sermon upon the text, Luke 24 : 26—"Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things?" 213–219

XVII.

THE BELIEVER'S UNION WITH CHRIST,

Printed in the Examiner, June 12, 1879, ... 220–225

XVIII.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS,

Originally prepared as a Sermon upon the text, Matt. 3 : 15 — "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," and preached before the Cincinnati Baptist Union ; printed in the Examiner, February 12, and February 19, 1880, ... 226–237

XIX.

CHRISTIAN TRUTH AND ITS KEEPERS,

An Address delivered before the American Baptist Publication Society, at its annual meeting in New York City, May, 1868, ... 238–244

XX.

UNCONSCIOUS ASSUMPTIONS OF COMMUNION POLEMICS,

Printed in the Examiner, January 21, 1875, ... 245–249

XXI.

THE TEACHER'S GUIDE AND HELPER,

A Sermon preached before the Sunday School Convention, Boston, May 20, 1877, on the text, 2 Cor. 3 : 6 — "Able ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the Spirit," 250–258

XXII.

COUNCILS OF ORDINATION: THEIR POWERS AND DUTIES,

Printed in the Examiner, January 2, and January 9, 1879, ... 259–268

XXIII.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

ON YOUNG MEN IN COURSES OF PREPARATORY STUDY,

An Address written for the Anniversary of Peddie Institute, Hightstown, N. J., June 17, 1875, ... 269–280

XXIV.

SOURCES OF SUPPLY FOR THE MINISTRY,

An Address before the Rhode Island Baptist Social Union, Providence, May, 1877 ; printed in the Watchman, Boston, October, 1878, 281–288

XXV.

THE LACK OF STUDENTS FOR THE MINISTRY,

An Address delivered at the annual meeting of the New York Baptist State Convention, Buffalo, October 25, 1883, ... 289–293

XXVI.

EDUCATION FOR THE MINISTRY: ITS PRINCIPLES AND ITS NECESSITY,

An Address delivered at the annual meeting of the Monroe Baptist Association, West Henrietta, N. Y., October 2, 1872, ... 294–301

XXVII.

EDUCATION FOR THE MINISTRY: ITS IDEA AND ITS REQUISITES,

An Address delivered at the Dedication of Rockfeller Hall, Rochester Theological Seminary, May 19, 1880, ... 302–313

XXVIII.

TRAINING FOR LEADERSHIP,

An Address delivered at the Dedication of the Theological Hall, Hamilton Theological Seminary, Hamilton, N. Y., June 16, 1886, 314–318

XXIX.

ARE OUR COLLEGES CHRISTIAN?

Printed in the Examiner, New York, July 19, 1883, ... 319–323

XXX.

NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION,

A Charge to the Candidate, at the Ordination of Mr. Ernest D. Burton, Acting Professor-elect in Newton Theological Institution, Rochester, June 22, 1883, ... 324–329

XXXI.

A GREAT TEACHER OF GREEK EXEGESIS,

An address at the Funeral of Professor Horatio B. Hackett, D. D., in the Second Baptist Church, Rochester, November 5, 1875, ... 330–336

XXXII.

CHURCH HISTORY, AND ONE WHO TAUGHT IT,

An Address at the Funeral of Professor R. J. W. Buckland, D. D., in the Second Baptist Church, Rochester, February 1, 1877, ... 337–343

XXXIII.

LEARNING IN THE PROFESSOR'S CHAIR,

Remarks at the Funeral of the Rev. V. R. Hotchkiss, D. D., in the First Baptist Church, Rochester, January 7, 1882, ... 344–346

XXXIV.

THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT,

A Sermon on the death of President Garfield, preached at the Central Presbyterian Church, Rochester, Sunday morning, September 25, 1881, on the text, 2 Samuel 2 : 23—"And it came to pass that as many as came to the place where Asahel fell down and died, stood still," 347–357

XXXV.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND ITS COMING,

A Sermon before the Judson Society of Missionary Inquiry, Brown University, Providence, R. I., August 31, 1869, ... 358–367

XXXVI.

LEAVING THE NINETY AND NINE,

A Sermon before the American Baptist Missionary Union, at its annual meeting, Indianapolis, May 22, 1881, on the text, Matt. 18 : 12—"Doth he not leave the ninety and nine?" 368–377

XXXVII.

THE ECONOMICS OF MISSIONS,

An Address before the Baptist Congress, Brooklyn, November 14, 1882, 378–386

XXXVIII.

THE THEOLOGY OF MISSIONS,

An Address of Welcome, at the meeting of the Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance, Rochester, October, 1885, ... 387–390

XXXIX.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE CHERUBIM,

A Sermon upon the text, Genesis 3 : 24—"So he drove out the man, and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life," 391–399

XL.

WOMAN'S PLACE AND WORK,

A Sermon preached in the First Baptist Church, Rochester, July 21, 1878, on the text, Genesis 2 : 18—"And the Lord God said : It is not good that the man should be alone ; I will make him an help meet for him," 400–409

XLI.

WOMAN'S WORK IN MISSIONS,

An Address before the Annual Convention of the American Women's Baptist Missionary Society, delivered in the First Baptist Church, Rochester, April 18, 1883, ... 410–417

XLII.

THE EDUCATION OF A WOMAN,

An Address delivered at the Annual Commencement of the Granger Place School, Canandaigua, N. Y., Tuesday morning, June 20, 1882, 418–430

XLIII.

RE-MARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE:

THE LAW OF THE STATE AND THE LAW OF SCRIPTURE,

Printed in the Examiner, February 17, and February 24, 1881, ... 431–442

XLIV.

CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY,

A Lecture before the Pennsylvania Ministers' Institute, Chester, Pa., June, 1871, ... 443–460

XLV.

GETTING AND SPENDING,

An Address at the "Ladies' Meeting" of the Baptist Social Union, Delmonico's, New York, November 1, 1883, ... 461–467

XLVI.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE EAST,

A Lecture before the Robinson Rhetorical Society of the Rochester Theological Seminary, February 25, 1878, ... 468–483

XLVII.

THE CRUSADES,

An Essay read before "The Club," Rochester, February 15, 1876, ... 484–500

XLVIII.

DANTE AND THE DIVINE COMEDY,

A Lecture delivered at Vassar College, February 21 and 22, 1888; printed in the Standard, Chicago, November, 1887, ... 501–524

XLIX.

POETRY AND ROBERT BROWNING,

A Lecture delivered at Wellesley College, May, 1886; printed in the Examiner, December, 1887, ... 525–543

L.

ADDRESSES TO SUCCESSIVE GRADUATING CLASSES

OF THE ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,

1873 : "The Three Onlies", ... 544–546
1874 : Truth and Love, ... 546–548
1875 : Manhood in the Ministry, ... 548–551
1876 : Work and Power, ... 552–554
1877 : Courage, Passive and Active, ... 554–557
1878 : True Dogmatism, ... 557–560
1879 : God's Leadings, ... 560–562
1880 : Self-Mastery, ... 562–566
1881 : Mental Qualities Requisite to the Pastor, ... 566–569
1882 : Adaptation, ... 569–572
1883 : Faith the Measure of Success, ... 572–575
1884 : Habits in the Ministry, ... 575–577
1885 : The Preacher's Doubts, ... 578–580
1886 : High-Mindedness, ... 580–583
1887 : Zeal for Christ, ... 583–586

"Wo zwei Hypothesen gleich möglich sind, die eine übereinstimmend mit moralischen Bedürfnissen, die andere mit ihnen streitend, kann nichts die Wahl zu Gunsten der letztern lenken."

Lotze, Medicin. Psych., 36.

Βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν· ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς Θεότητος σωματικῶς, καὶ ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας.

Paul, Coloss., 2: 8–10.

I.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.*

On the last page of "Tom Brown at Rugby" there is a vivid and soulful picture of Tom's return, years after his school-days are ended, to the scene of his early scrapes and triumphs. He enters the chapel and once more takes his seat on the lowest bench, in the very place he occupied as a little boy on his first Sunday at Rugby. On the oaken paneling he sees scratched the name of the youngster who sat that day by his side. Upon the great painted window the same shadows of the trees seem dancing that drew his thoughts from service and sermon long ago. The chapel is empty now. No rows of boys fill the benches. The solid English face that burned with such intensity of love for truth and such noble scorn of moral cowardice looks down no longer from the pulpit. "The Doctor," the great Arnold, sleeps now under the stone pavement of the chapel-floor. As Tom Brown meditates, there seem to rise before him the forms of the living and the dead whom he once met there — many of them braver and purer than he, yet scarcely known till now. Now, for the first time, he comprehends his debt to them and to him whose commanding spirit bound them all together. The lofty teachings of that sacred place assume an aspect of ideal grandeur that awes, inspires and rebukes him. Humbled in spirit, and melted to grateful tears, he kneels before the altar, at the grave of Arnold, and renews his vows of consecration to that greater Master to whom Arnold led him.

The day of our return to these haunts of our early learning, brethren of the Alumni, is in like manner a day of mingled sorrow and joy. There is a reverent regard for those at whose feet we sat which makes these scenes sacred to us, though in the presence of the living it finds only a faint expression in words. There is thankfulness of spirit, as we gather from different parts of the great harvest-field and rejoice together over the blessing that has followed our labors. Though the sheaves we bring are not so many nor so large as we had hoped, and "old Adam has proved too strong for young Melancthon," yet there is a confidence within us, which we never could have had without these years of experience, that old Adam is not too strong for Christ. Before us too there rise the faces of some whose work is all complete and whose souls have entered into rest. A little musing, a little forgetfulness of the sights and sounds around us, and

> "The forms of the departed
> Enter at the open door;
> The beloved, the true hearted,
> Come to visit us once more.

* An Address before the Alumni of the Rochester Theological Seminary, at their annual meeting, May 20th, 1868, and printed in the Baptist Quarterly, 2 : 393 *sq.*

They, the young and strong, who cherished
Noble longings for the strife,—
By the roadside fell and perished,
Weary of the march of life."

In the presence of these memories we are subdued and yet exalted. Our noblest resolves are strengthened by the thought that "such as these have lived and died." But a more than mortal presence is here also. Christ is here — the same Christ into whose hands we gave our lives as we went out into the world's great strife. His truth remains — the same truth of which we gained glimpses during those early years of preparation, but which now fills a larger arc of our vision. It would seem that the only fitting employment for such an hour as this must be the consideration of some one of those great relations which affect our success as ministers of Christ, and which have to do with the defense and propagation of the faith. I am sure that no preacher who has received his training here will deem me unpractical when I propose as the theme of the evening: PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION. I ask your attention to three separate divisions of my subject: first, the debt of religion to philosophy; secondly, the dangers of philosophy the dangers of religion also; and thirdly, an impartial philosophy essential to the perfect triumph of religion.

Religion may be viewed in two aspects, according as we look upon its speculative or its practical side. It may exist in the mind of a child, in the shape of reverence, love, and trust towards God, long before the child has given any conscious account to itself of its faith. It may exist, on the other hand, in the mind of the scientific theologian, in the shape of a thoroughly digested doctrinal system, though the system may not yet have melted the heart and run the activities of the life into its moulds. Let it never be forgotten, however, that either one of these sides of religion tends to complete itself by the production of the other. Like positive and negative electricity, the one attracts the other, and without the other cannot be made perfect. The child, for example, grows to maturity of years. Every step of that growing maturity is marked by an increasing habit of introspection. The faith that once seemed intuitive assumes definite form and order to the reason. The truths once held by the intellect in a state of solution are precipitated and crystallized about some centre. As the nebular hypothesis supposes a revolving fire-mist diffused throughout the universe, which condenses as it whirls, until the worlds are thrown off with their harmonious movements and their perfect beauty, so the child's faith, once vague and unreasoning, cannot exist forever in the form of nebula, but turns and seethes and solidifies, until it comes to be a little solar system for interdependence and order. And, in like manner, the student of scientific theology must shut his ears continually to the voices that fill the air of that lofty region of thought, if he would prevent the religion of the intellect from becoming a religion of the heart. Both Chalmers and De Wette were men with whom the scientific interest became at last a practical interest, and who found theology a school-master to lead them to Christ.

Now religion, as a scientific system, rests upon a basis of philosophy. The inevitable tendency of the mind to form to itself a definite and connected scheme of knowledge impels it, not only to bring its religious beliefs into connection and order, but to search for the foundations of those beliefs.

It cannot content itself with theology proper. Besides giving to the truths of revelation a scientific form, it desires to know what are the proofs of revelation, and what are the evidences that a God exists from whom a revelation might come. There can be no peace to the logical understanding until these questions are answered; but the answer to them is impossible without philosophy. For, this is the difference between theology and philosophy: Theology begins with the revelation of God and the consciousness of God, and from these, by a synthetic method, constructs her system. Philosophy, on the other hand, begins with those underlying facts of mind and matter from which we argue the existence of a God, and the authority of revelation. Pursuing an analytic method, it asks whether we have any real knowledge of these facts; it seeks to give an accurate and complete account of these facts; it aims to determine whether these facts warrant the erection upon them of so vast a superstructure. Any one who has traveled in Holland will remember those marvelous cities that have risen from the beds of ancient marshes, supported upon myriads of piles driven into the yielding soil. Many a church is towerless there, because the foundations cannot be trusted to bear a greater weight. Many a wall on private streets is cracked from top to bottom by the settling of the piles beneath it. Many a grain-merchant, with tons of golden corn stored in his granary, passes his days and nights in fear, lest some unusual weight may reveal a weakness in the supports beneath. Let it be whispered that the foundations of the Town-Hall of Amsterdam are sinking, and there is no quieting the town until men of experience have examined those foundations, and found them sure. Now it is a most serious question whether religion, so far as it is a scientific system, is like one of those immense structures in the Netherlands that are built upon the sand, and may, some years from now, give way and tumble to the ground; or whether, like St. Peter's at Rome, its foundations go down to the everlasting rock. And philosophy is the science of foundations. It busies itself with the examination of the grounds of faith. It seeks to determine whether religion has a safe basis and support in the facts of consciousness.

There is still another service which philosophy renders to religion, namely, that of defining and correlating the great primary conceptions of revelation. The ideas of conscience, virtue, liberty, providence, God, are given to us by revelation in the concrete. Philosophy seeks either to analyze them or to show that they are incapable of analysis, and having ascertained their intrinsic significance, aims to set them in reconciliation with the remaining facts of our mental constitution, and with our observation of the world. So far as theology argues from the mental constitution of man, indeed, she must get her facts from philosophy. Her doctrine of the will, and her determination of the limits of the human faculties, her application of realism to the unity of the race, and her theory of the true end of being, must all be ultimately given her by the prior philosophy with which she sets out in her investigations. Both in her account of the universe and in her account of God, theology is obliged to combine with the facts of revelation the facts of consciousness, since only through consciousness have we any personal knowledge of either. We stand between God and the world. We must interpret matter by mind, and God by mind, and that interpretation is

impossible without a philosophy of mind. Upon the front of the temple of Apollo at Delphi, Plutarch declares that the two Greek letters Epsilon Iota were inscribed. It was the word "Thou art!"— and this, John Howe, in his preface to the "Living Temple," interprets to be an assertion of the eternal existence of the god. But upon that same temple-front, according to an old tradition, was another inscription,—this namely: "Know thyself!" May it not be that the Puritan divine gave the Epsilon Iota a wrong interpretation, and that both the inscriptions had one common object — to admonish him who entered the sacred fane that all knowledge of divinity must proceed from self-knowledge? "Thou art, O soul! Know then thyself! Understand first thine own existence and attributes, so shalt thou best know the divine, of which thou art the image." So at the gate of the temple of Theology the inscription might well be placed: "Thou art! Know thyself!" for a true knowledge of mind is indispensable to a scientific exposition of religion.

I do not forget, however, that something more than abstract reasoning is needed, to set forth convincingly the debt which religion owes to philosophy. Let me ask you for a moment to look at the matter in the light of history. Have you ever reflected upon the remarkable difference in form that exists between Augustine and Calvin,— between the massy ore of Augustine's theologizing and the stamped and minted coin of Calvin's Institutes? Both held the same great fundamental doctrines, but Calvin has put them into a scientific order and organized them into a comprehensive system which would have been utterly impossible in Augustine's day. No one can fail to see that between the fourth and the sixteenth centuries theology has made a great advance in arrangement, in compactness, in logical force, in practical power. And to what shall we attribute this advance? To nothing more or less than the influence of that Aristotle, whom Luther called "an accursed, mischief-making heathen." It was the study of Aristotle which first made theology a science, and rendered possible a Calvin. That mighty movement of the human mind which we call Scholasticism, with its noble attempts to define and prove every doctrine of religion on principles of reason, and its rich results for modern philosophical theology, was a child of Aristotle's logic. By it, the matter of theology, received from Augustine, and full therefore of his Platonic realism and soaring contempt for matter, was worked up into new shape for the uses of the coming times. Thus both the Platonic and Aristotelian philosophies, one at heart though different in method, have disciplined the forces of theology and made them available. And their influence is felt the moment we compare Augustine, in whose works the truths of religion lie scattered about like raw recruits bivouacked for the night, with Calvin, who draws up those same truths like soldiers in line of battle, ready on the instant for attack or defense. Men may decry philosophy, but it is only by ignoring what philosophy has wrought. Still those sceptred kings of abstract thought control the minds of living men, and rule us from their urns. Take away the influence of Plato and Aristotle, and you put a scientific theology where John of Damascus found it eleven centuries ago.

There is little time to mention the services of modern philosophical thinkers to religion. Who can overestimate the magnificent contribution to our knowledge of the ethical nature of God which Bishop Butler made, when

he propounded and demonstrated his celebrated doctrine of the supremacy of conscience in the moral constitution of man? What but the works of Coleridge, splendid even in their incompleteness, rescued the theological thinking of England from the slough of utilitarianism and materialism into which Locke and Paley had led it, and by setting it upon the rock of a true spiritual philosophy, gave it a foothold and vantage-ground from which to contend against the incoming flood of German pantheism? The mere mention of these facts is sufficient to show that there is no possibility of understanding the history of theology without a previous study of philosophy. Nor is the effect of philosophy confined simply to the modification of systems of abstract theology. Whatever affects theology comes ultimately to affect the practical experience and working of Christianity. Through its influence on theology, philosophy exercises the most potent influence upon the whole religious life of the church. I find Bancroft, himself no theologian, depicting in these words the influence of Jonathan Edwards' speculations with regard to the nature of virtue and the freedom of the will. "Edwards," he says, "makes a turning-point in the intellectual, or as he would have called it, the spiritual, history of New England. The faith condensed in the symbols of Calvinism demanded to be subjected to free inquiry, and 'without dodging, shuffling, hiding, or turning the back,' to be shown to be in harmony with reason and common sense. In the age following, the influence of Edwards is discernible upon every leading mind. He that will trace the transition of Calvinism from a haughty self-assertion of the doctrine of election against the pride of oppression, to its adoption of love as the central point of its view of creation and the duty of the created,—he that will know the workings of the mind of New England in the middle of the last century, and the throbbings of its heart, must give his days and nights to the study of Jonathan Edwards." Thus a single philosophic mind may change for the better the style of religion for a whole generation, or a whole century. The number influenced consciously and directly by him may be few; the great mass of men who come after him, may be quite unaware of his existence; still his power over them is no less sure. There is a slow movement of the glaciers in the Alps by which the snow that fell years ago upon the summit of Mont Blanc or the Jungfrau comes down at last in the shape of solid ice to the valleys far below, and by its melting furnishes a refreshing draught to the tired laborer in the meadows as he throws himself upon the earth for his noonday meal. It is so with the speculations of abstract thinkers. Conceived upon the very mountain-tops of thought they may be, yet by a law as irresistible as that of gravitation they find their way downwards, through subordinate interpreters, and by a thousand channels of the printed page and the spoken word, until they reach the homes and hearts of common men.

I have thus indicated the debt which religion, both as a system and a life, owes to philosophy. It cannot have escaped your notice that the same weapon which has struck such stout blows for Christianity has often been used against her. And this brings me to the second division of my theme, namely this: The dangers of philosophy are the dangers also of religion. I say the dangers of philosophy, for I cannot conceal from myself the fact that through the whole history of speculation there has been a constant tendency to one or the other of two extremes. The great principle, which Robertson so

remarkably illustrated in the better portion of his teachings, that truth is made up of two opposite propositions and is not found in the *via media* between the two, is a principle which both philosophy and theology have quite too often neglected. Theology, for example, has two factors given to her, both indisputably true, yet logically irreconcilable with one another — I mean, divine sovereignty and human freedom. Between these two poles the world of theologic thought has been swinging for ages like a pendulum. And yet how often has an inveterate and unregulated passion for unity led the theologian to construct his system about one of these poles as its centre, while the other was virtually ignored or forgotten. So, in philosophy, all consciousness involves duality. There are two things different in kind — matter and spirit. To accept the veritable existence of the one, and to deny the other, is to falsify the most palpable of facts. Yet an overweening logic has sought, in every age, to build a scheme of knowledge upon a single one of these two elements, while the other has been pared down to fit into some odd niche in the temple where its twin-brother was the sole object of worship. Thus have risen systems of Idealism, declaring virtually that matter is spirit; systems of Materialism, declaring that spirit is matter; and then for those who could not find either of these schemes to their taste, systems of Absolute Identity, declaring that both matter and spirit are but forms of one substance which underlies both, a sort of *substantia una et unica*. All of these systems, as has been well said, are seductive from their seeming simplicity, but are simple only through mutilation. Let us acknowledge that there is not only a passion for unity, which is native to the mind, but that there must be in all science a real unity of which that same mind furnishes us the type; but let us never fail to allow the facts of consciousness to decide the nature of that unity. Let the modern chemist, like Youmans, believe if he will that all the elements of matter which have hitherto been considered simple are merely modifications of some one ultimate substance which exists in forms even more unlike each other than the black charcoal and the glittering diamond; let him insist, as much as he pleases, that science already proclaims this to be her belief by expressing the atomic weights of all her elements in multiples of hydrogen, and by her hypothesis that heat, motion, light and electricity are all forms of some one ultimate force into which they are mutually convertible, — but there let him stop. When he goes further and asserts that mind is but this same force liberated and transformed by chemical changes in the brain; when he declares that this search for unity is so irresistible a feature of our mental constitution that we cannot believe in the existence of spirit *and* matter, but must by a necessity of mind resolve one into the other, or both into one, he is simply throttling the facts of mind, with the hope that, as dead men tell no tales, he can build up a complete system solely upon the facts of matter. Such a manipulation of facts to suit a preconceived theory falsifies the very principle of induction upon which all science is based. To dispose of half the facts of consciousness by denying that mind is essentially distinct from matter is to achieve unity at the sacrifice of all our knowledge. Such a method of solving the great problem of the universe reminds us of that grim familiar tale of the cannibal-chief who professed conversion, but was informed by the missionary that he must renounce polygamy by giving up his second wife,

before he could receive the ordinance of baptism. On the return of the missionary the following year, the chief presented himself with smiles for the holy rite, and on being interrogated as to what he had done with his wife, he replied with a glow of satisfaction: "Me eat her!"

Any theory of philosophy which is based upon a monistic hypothesis, and which denies the facts of either matter or mind, must exert a deadly influence upon theology and religion. The ultimate conclusion must be that God is the universe or that the universe is God — in other words, there is no God separate from the soul or the world. And in the precise proportion to which the view of mind leans to one or the other extreme, will the religious thinking of the individual and the age lean towards Materialism or Pantheism. There are two men who have figured largely in theological controversy whose opposite conclusions may illustrate this two-fold danger. There is John Henry Newman — apparently concerning himself but little with philosophy, yet having his whole theology and life dominated by a purely metaphysical notion. In his "Apologia Pro Vita Sua," he tells us that from his very boyhood he carried with him a certain constitutional frame of mind resembling the Berkeleian Idealism. "All the external universe" (I quote from a late writer), "seemed to him a deception, an angelic extravaganza, a spangled phantasmagory of zodiacal signs and hieroglyphics, a vivid environment of sacramental symbolisms and picture-writings, speaking to him of a Great Being, besides whom and his own soul there was no other. Dwelling long within the blazing cabalistic ether of this cosmological conception, till his soul had learned its language and could think in no other, but tenacious of a principle which had also strongly possessed him from an early age, that of the necessity of dogma, Dr. Newman passed on gradually but logically to his peculiar ecclesiasticism, and became what he has become"— one of the most unquestioning adherents and advocates of the Romish faith. And there, on the other hand, is Joseph Priestley — beginning with a tendency precisely the opposite, fixing his faith on nothing which had not the evidence of sense impressed upon it, and unable even to conceive of a spiritual idea until he had cast it into a material mould. As you watch his mental progress you perceive him getting his notions of mind from retorts and electrical machines, until Hartley's theory of vibrations, with slight modifications, seems to include and explain all the facts of our mental constitution. And from this sensational philosophy what theology was evolved? Nothing more nor less than a bald Socinianism which ignored all the profounder truths of revelation, left nothing in Christ which could be worshiped, and reduced Christian experience to a mere matter of the reason. Newman and Priestley are examples of the pernicious influence upon theology of a philosophy which, without avowing it, leans to one of the two extremes of Idealism or Empiricism. I surely do not need to point you to the malign influences which have been exerted on a wider scale by whole systems of philosophy. The Sensationalism of Locke, developed and carried to its extremest results by Condillac and the French Encyclopædists, poured over France like a torrent, sweeping away all belief in man's spiritual dignity, and with the conviction of human accountability and immortality, burying beneath the flood all idea of a God, until the Revolution came to clear away the rubbish and make room once more for the faiths that had been destroyed.

And on the other hand the Kantian philosophy, with its extreme subjective tendencies developed by Schelling and Hegel, declared that man could know all by being himself the All in miniature, even as the drop of water can reflect upon its surface the earth beneath and all the constellations of the cope of heaven. While Empiricism ended in the absolute denial of a God, Idealism found its consummation in a Pantheistic scheme which confounded the universe with God, and made all human lives and actions but the brilliant bubbles that rise for a moment and then disappear upon the endless current of impersonal and unconscious being.

With these systems before us, and with the practical evidence of their power for evil in the pervading tendency and tone of modern Continental theology and religion and in the general skepticism of the French and German mind, it is vain to ignore the dangers which rise from a false philosophy. Yet I suspect another danger is before us, as great or even greater than any which Christianity has met and conquered. There is a philosophy now rising to power which seems to me more deadly than any other, because it consists in the denial of all philosophy. A philosophy of Nescience is worse than a philosophy of Omniscience. The one still leaves us the reality of mind from which to argue the existence of a God. The other, like Nero, when he wished that all the people of Rome had one neck that he might at one blow behead them all, gathers all the facts of mental consciousness together and by a single stroke puts them out of existence. By that same stroke that destroys all knowledge of the human mind you have destroyed all knowledge of Him who made the mind. In every production of writers of this class, as Lewes and Draper, you seem to hear the jubilant refrain: "Great Pan is dead. The age of Metaphysics has happily ended. Philosophy is forever impossible." A spontaneous vegetative life is substituted for the apprehension of spiritual realities. Mind is but a product of organization and thought is only cerebration. Thus in effect man is bidden to act the part of the wretched miser of Bunyan's dream who bends ever toward the earth, gathering straws with his muck-rake, while all the while a golden crown hangs suspended just above him, unseen and unregarded. God, heaven, freedom, conscience, immortality, are all the diseased imaginations of an unscientific age. These are the logical results of a philosophy which starts with the denial of any direct knowledge of the mind. But there are thousands who accept its principles without foreseeing these results. The array of investigators and followers who may be classed as Positivists in philosophy is very great. There are great names among them. Mill and Bain and Spencer in England are minds of rare erudition and acumen. But there are lesser satellites that revolve about these suns of the system and reflect their light. The youthful writers for the London Times quote John Stuart Mill as the only authority in philosophy. There are itinerant lecturers among us who winter after winter deliver, to audiences innocent of all suspicion of their drift, lengthy tirades against metaphysics, and arguments to show that the observation of our own mental states is as impossible and absurd as to stand still and walk around one's self. There are in all our Sabbath congregations men who drink in this philosophy of Nescience from magazines and scientific periodicals, and who are prepared thereby to look upon the sermon from the pulpit as so much pleasant moonshine for purblind

intellects that cannot bear the sunlight. There are few of us, I am persuaded, who realize to what extent this godless philosophy has taken hold of the educated minds of the generation, and has warped their views of religion. You see the results of it in the disposition of certain divines to accept Mr. Huxley as an authority with regard to the creation, and to sit at the feet of Baden Powell for teaching with regard to the possibility of a literal destruction of the world by fire. Outside the ministry it appears in the popular hue and cry against metaphysics, and in the increasing lack of sympathy with the Christian church on the part of those whose pursuits bring them most in contact with physical science. There has been a vast change in this respect in twenty years. Time was when philosophy and history brought the results of their investigations and laid them upon the altar of religion. The tendency now is to deny that there exists such a thing as metaphysical or moral science, and to treat as a weakness of intellect any attempt to interpret the world of matter by the world of mind.

I do not need to tell you that the coryphæus of this new philosophy of Nescience is Auguste Comte. Scarcely recognized as a thinker during his lifetime, he promises, now that he is dead, to be the master of the scientific thought of the next twenty years. His classification of the sciences, though chargeable with many errors, proves him to be one of the leading minds of the age. Every one of the fundamental principles of his philosophy, however, is at war with a sound psychology. As a notable illustration of the necessity of beginning our theological thinking with correct principles of mind, let me point out to you two of the fundamental errors of Positivism, and the results to which they logically lead in our notions with regard to religious truth. Take for example his postulate that we know nothing but the phenomena of matter, and that mind, if there be such a thing, lies wholly out of reach of direct observation. Nothing could more plainly than this contradict the consciousness of men. In the same act by which I know matter, I know myself as distinct from matter and as knowing matter. I can see two things at a time, namely, self and not-self. I have knowledge of my own mental states by memory. I know what I was, as well as what I am. To deny these deliverances of consciousness is to declare that I know nothing; for I have the same evidence for the existence of my own mental states that I have for the existence of outward phenomena. The mind is just as open to inspection as the world around me. The same rule that excludes as invalid my knowledge of myself must exclude as invalid my knowledge of matter. It is singular, as Mr. Martineau has somewhere said, that certain philosophers take such unconscious delight in knocking out their own brains. Comte seems quite unaware that the same scythe with which he mows down the psychologists cuts off his own legs also. For how can science be built up of the phenomena of matter? Observation of facts is not science. The mere grouping of facts is not science. Science is a thing of the mind, and not of matter only. Unless there be a mental potency prior to all experience, no experience is possible. A structural pre-equipment of mind is necessary in order to correlate and arrange phenomena. The very idea of unity by which we classify facts must come to us from the unity of our own self-consciousness. Unless the primitive beliefs of substance, resemblance, power, which are a part of the

original endowment of the mind, and which flash out from latency into living energy the moment we are brought in contact with the phenomena of the outer world,— unless these primitive beliefs by which we mould external facts into shape and clothe them with meaning are just as much objects of knowledge, and have as much validity, as the outward facts which we know through the testimony of the senses,— all science is forever impossible. You might as well collect together a heap of arms and legs and heads from a dissecting room and call them living men, as to collect together mere facts and call them science. Science is made up of facts *and ideas*. If we cannot know anything but facts, if there be no such thing as phenomena of mind, if the mind be not an organism whose workings can be observed in consciousness, then the foundations of all knowledge are swept away, and the whole structure sinks "deeper than plummet ever sounded." In the Arabian Nights, there is a curious story of a mountain of loadstone, which the sailors greet with delight as the sign of some hospitable shore, where they may rest from the tempests of the deep. But as they draw near, the mighty mass of loadstone exerts its magnetic attraction upon every particle of iron in the vessel, until every nail and bolt is drawn from its place, and the ship goes to pieces, a miserable wreck. M. Comte has discovered a mountain of loadstone in this principle that all our knowledge is confined to the phenomena of matter,— it draws every fastening from his bark, and brings his new philosophy to total dissolution.

A similar absurdity is involved in another great principle of this philosophy, namely, the denial of causes, both efficient and final. What we call cause and effect is, it seems, only regularity of sequence. Dr. Hickok has given us an ingenious illustration of the principle of causality which may serve to set forth the precise nature of Comte's denial. Suppose two cog-wheels, with interlocking teeth. Each of these wheels is connected with a steam engine, which moves it. Both engines are working at the same rate of speed, so that the wheels revolve without interfering with each other. Each wheel obeys the impulse of its own engine, and neither is moved by the other. Interlocked though the cogs are, the relation between their motions is simply one of resemblance. But let one of these wheels be detached from the engine that just now moved it. To all appearance, the wheels move as before, yet it is plain that there is a new relation between their motions,—a principle of causality has come in,— the motion of the one is now the cause of the motion of the other. Now Comte denies the reality of any such notion as cause. He declares that the wheels move together in the one case just as they do in the other — there is no new relation established between them when one engine ceases its motion. The simultaneous movement of the wheels in the first case, as in the last, is the sum and substance of the whole. What can be meant by law — where is the place for law upon this theory? Law must be something fixed and not phenomenal — something behind phenomena which produces phenomena. But the only law which such a theory as this admits is the arbitrary succession of phenomena, without method or cause. In other words, instead of accepting the old axiom, *ex nihilo nihil fit*, he seems to insist that *ex nihilo omnia fiunt*. And so the causal judgment which we form the moment we observe phenomena, and which is just as strong in the mind of the child as in the mind of the mature man, is

resolved into a persuasion that because we have observed that each event follows some other event, it will probably be so again. It is not too much to say that this confounding of the necessary with the customary is contradicted by the consciousness of every man and child upon the planet. By an irresistible law of thought, every change whatsoever is recognized to be the result of some power that effects the change — a power behind the phenomena and separate from them,— a power of which we have the type and proof in every effect which our own wills produce upon our own organism or upon the outward world. The natural result is that Comte has no such thing as an Inductive Logic, and can have none. Where there is no Causation, there can be no law; where there is no law, there can be no logic. And this is not all. By this same rule which excludes the idea of Causation, all the grandest intuitions of the soul are immolated, for they all rest upon the same evidence. We lose all proof that either spirit or matter exists back of the phenomena open to the senses. We have no warrant for believing that matter is anything more than a possibility of sensations, or that mind is anything more than a series of feelings aware of its own existence. Even mathematical truth is purely phenomenal. Two and two, it is true, make four with us, but it is only because we are used to it. In the planet Jupiter, where the customs of society are different, two and two may make five. There is no such thing as absolute truth. Right and wrong themselves are matters of convention. There is no eternal necessity in our nature which makes the right praiseworthy and the wrong condemnable. We have perceived the consequences of lying to be bad — we call it a vice therefore. But in the star Sirius, or even in the moon, where the consequences are more happy, lying may be a virtue. The universe is a Cosmos no longer. There is no will binding its parts together. The world and its events are but a procession of phantoms without connection or order, of whose origin, significance and destination we know absolutely nothing,— a conclusion of absolute skepticism which Lord Neaves justly ridicules in the persons of Mill and Hume, its advocates, by the following humorous lines :—

"Against a stone you strike your toe;
You feel 't is sore, it makes a clatter;
But what you feel is all you know
Of toe, or stone, or mind, or matter.
Mill and Hume of mind and matter
Wouldn't leave a rag or tatter:
What although
We feel the blow?
That doesn't show there's mind or matter.

"Had I skill like Stuart Mill,
His own position I could shatter;
The weight of Mill I count as *nil*,
If Mill has neither mind nor matter.
Mill, when *minus* mind and matter,
Though he make a kind of clatter,
Must himself
Just mount the shelf,
And there be laid with mind and matter."

As if these conclusions were not sufficiently absurd, we have the direct denial that there is such a thing as purpose in the Universe. What are called marks of design are only accidental coincidences. Final causes are

merged in the totality of secondary causes. The sole explanation of the wondrous adaptations of nature to the good of man is that these are simply the result of mechanical laws. There is no sense in wondering at the order of the heavenly spheres, — with the laws that govern nature, how could there be any disorder? Thus the lofty thought of the classic poet that the highest link of nature's chain must needs be tied to the foot of Jupiter's chair is exchanged for the blasphemous assertion that the heavens declare, not the glory of God, but the glory of the Astronomer. But the followers of Comte convict themselves of folly by their unintentional use of language which implies adaptation in nature. Darwin is obliged to speak continually of the *design* of such and such a series of arrangements, as for example, that required for the fertilization of orchids. On Comte's own showing, there has been a curious design in the arrangement of all things from the very beginning with reference to the development at last of a true philosophy — a wonderful series of adaptations by which, when time was ripe and the world's needs greatest, a Comte was brought forth, and humanity delivered from its metaphysical and theologic folly. Surely a design like this, executed too only through unnumbered subordinate adaptations and arrangements of human character and history, proves a designer of endless wisdom and goodness. But says Maudsley, one of the Positivist camp-followers: "Design, according to Spinoza's sagacious remark, would imply imperfection in the designer — a necessity of adding something to himself to make up his sum of blessedness — and this notion involves you in a self-contradiction, for imperfection of any sort is inconsistent with your very idea of God." But what sort of a God would be Mr. Maudsley's perfect God? His only notion of a God must be that of a being not so great or free or active as ourselves — an Asiatic Brahma, as "idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean." No, — the forthputting of designing wisdom and of creative power is not inconsistent with infinite perfection, since it is voluntary *self*-limitation, for the sake of revealing his glory. God is limited by nothing *outside* himself, but only by the decrees of his own most free and blessed will; and such a self-limitation is only a proof and fruit of infinite perfection. Or again, when the Positivist argues that the imperfection of the design proves the absence of all purpose in the Universe, it is hard to tell which is to be most condemned, the ignorance of the objection or its presumption. It is the old boast of Alphonso of Castile, that if he had been present with the Almighty when the Universe was planned he could have suggested to him some valuable improvements. The Universe, it seems, can with all its imperfections produce a Comte, but cannot equal his intelligence. Or, if a serious reply must be made to an argument so shallow, we might show that the whole tendency of modern science, nay, the very principle that guides her in all her researches, is to take for granted that there must be adaptations and uses in things whose purpose and design have hitherto been hidden. Increasing knowledge has only taught her that everything is for some end, — and even if it were ultimately discovered that there was organic imperfection in the System, it would only prove a deeper adaptation of that system to man's state of conscious moral discord and evil, an adaptation revealing to him the ruin sin has wrought, and exciting in him longings for the deliverance from bondage of the whole creation of God.

The tendencies of a philosophy built upon such principles as these are too manifest to require elucidation. They tear up Philosophy by the roots, and Religion must share the fate of Philosophy. One of Comte's grandest generalizations indeed is this, that theology and metaphysics are relics of the race's infancy, necessary stages in human progress, but to be regarded in these days only as stepping-stones which may be removed, now that we have risen by them from infancy to manhood. Biology is only a part of physiology; brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile; man, to use Dr. Holmes' simile, is only "a drop of water imprisoned in a crystal, one little particle in the crystalline prism of the solid universe." All his higher ideas of that Universe, its forms of beauty, its divine arrangements, its moral influences, are cast aside as worthless. All his noblest intuitions — substance causation, law, freedom, conscience, accountability, immortality — are metaphysical or theological chimæras. There is no place for sin nor for repentance. There is no God to direct the blind, resistless forces of nature, or to hear and answer the cry that rises from the desolate heart of man. In the terrible language of Holyoake, one of the advocates of this Atheistic creed: "Science has shown us that we are under the dominion of general laws, and that there is no special Providence. Nature acts with fearful uniformity; stern as fate, absolute as tyranny, merciless as death; too vast to praise, too inexplicable to worship, too inexorable to propitiate; it has no ear for prayer, no heart for sympathy, no arm to save." With such a picture of the Universe before us, we seem enshrouded by the darkness of Byron's dream:

"The bright sun is extinguished, and the stars
Do wander darkling in the eternal space,
Rayless and pathless; and the icy earth
Swings blind and blackening in the moonless air.
Morn comes and goes — and comes, but brings no day,
And men forget their passions in the dread
Of this their desolation, and all hearts
Are chilled into a selfish prayer for light.

* * * * * * * * * * *

The waves are dead; the tides are in their grave;
The moon, their mistress, has expired before;
The winds are withered in the stagnant air,
And the clouds perished; Darkness had no need
Of aid from them — She was the Universe."

And Comte himself has given us proof, if any such were needed, that the human soul revolts at the picture of a universe without a God, and has an instinct implanted in its very constitution which cannot be satisfied without some semblance of worship. The later speculations of the great Positivist aimed at nothing less than the establishment of a new religion which should dispense with the notion of a Deity or a revelation, a religion of which Comte himself was to be Sovereign Pontiff and Supreme Lawgiver. The object of adoration is Collective Humanity or the totality of all the forces engaged in the perfecting of the race, embracing therefore the solid earth itself which supports this race,—the former to be designated as the "Great Being" and the latter as the "Great Fetish." Three hundred and sixty-five of the world's benefactors are chosen to represent humanity as objects of worship, and the statues of all these are set up in the Pantheon of the new religion that each day of the year may have its special saint for com-

memoration. For the separate weeks and months there are *dii majores*, or greater gods, and among them Confucius, Voltaire and Mahomet, though no place is found for Christ. For private devotion, there is the adoration of the mother, the wife, the daughter. An ejaculatory prayer is proposed consisting of the following words: "Love as our principle; order as our basis; progress as our end." Instead of the sign of the Cross, so common in the Romish Church, the three principal cerebral organs are to be thoughtfully touched by the finger. For priests there is a College of *Savants;* for sacraments there are birthday, wedding and funeral rites; for the last judgment there is a posthumous decision of learned men upon the merits or demerits of the dead; the fame of this decision stands for immortality, and a civilized earth is made to serve for heaven. Such is the substitute for the religion of the Bible, proposed by the Atheistic philosopher. Revolting at the childishness of worshiping God, he constructs a religion in which the race shall worship man. With such poetic justice is the truth avenged. With such unconsciousness of its own nature does the wisdom of this world prove itself to be foolishness in the sight of God.

What has been said will prepare you for the few words in which I shall present the last thought of my subject. It is this: An impartial philosophy is essential to the perfect triumph of religion. If the universal sway of Christianity is to be brought about in accordance with the common laws of mind, it would seem that a true philosophy must be one of God's chosen weapons for subduing the world to Christ. Christianity has not only nothing to fear from a true science of the mind, but she must recognize in such science her indispensable coadjutor and ally. The stress of the argument against Christianity among investigators of physical truth is not so much theological as it is philosophical, and this fact is but the illustration of that wider principle enunciated by Sir William Hamilton, that "there is no difficulty emerging in theology which has not first emerged in philosophy." In spite of M. Comte, philosophy will exist while the world stands. It is time for the Christian church and the Christian ministry to understand its power, and instead of deploring its influence or treating it with shallow contempt, to use every effort to bring it into the service of Christ. As the greatest thinker of New England said a century ago: "There is no need that strict philosophical truth be at all concealed from men — no danger in contemplation and discovery in these things. The truth is extremely needful to be known, and the more clearly and perfectly the real fact is known, and the more constantly kept in view, the better. The clear and full knowledge of the true system of the universe will greatly establish the true Christian Scheme of divine administration in the City of God." Let us have done then, once for all, with the notion that metaphysical studies are beside the proper work of the preacher, and by necessity mystify his brain and destroy his practical power. The history of the church has shown that philosophy, instead of weakening the grasp and corrupting the principles of her preachers, has been their great discipline and strength. No man can clearly present or successfully defend the truths of religion without knowing them in their principles. A teacher of religion who sneers at metaphysics, as if it were a fog-bank in which only fools would risk their lives, is simply playing into the hands of infidelity and virtually declaring

that all true philosophy is on the side of the enemies of religion. To fill his place as a preacher in these days he must know the foundations of his faith in the human consciousness; must have some proper sense of those grand primitive affirmations of the soul, which,

> "be they what they may,
> Are yet the fountain-light of all our day,
> Are yet the master-light of all our seeing."

He must be able to show the dabbler in an Atheistic philosophy whither the principles he has ignorantly adopted will lead him; how completely these principles affront the reason and mock the religious nature of man; how they are based upon a single primary misconception with regard to the sources of our knowledge; how a simple confidence in the original intuitions of the mind will restore to us the world, the soul and God; how that confidence is the indispensable basis of all science, while a denial of a single one of these original convictions is like

> "the little rift within the lute,
> That by and by will make the music mute,
> And, ever widening, slowly silence all."

It is the business of the preacher to know the false philosophy which threatens to leaven society, in order that in its place he may put the true. And this he can do in a thousand ways. Formal metaphysical disquisitions in the pulpit will never accomplish anything; but the incidental statement in sermon and correspondence and conversation of the fundamental errors of a false philosophy, accompanied by a simple *reductio ad absurdum*, will open the eyes of many who have unconsciously imbibed notions hostile to the true faith. The preacher is not only bound by his duty to God never to despair of philosophy himself, but is under obligation to labor and to pray that a true philosophy may uproot the false, and prepare the way for the final triumph of religion.

A true philosophy! It has been the dream and quest of earth's noblest spirits. But have they discovered the object of their search? Must not the world still ask: "Where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?" We answer both yes and no. There has always been a true philosophy in the world side by side with the false. Side by side with the philosophies of Epicurus and the Stoics, partial in their sources and their results, dwelt for ages the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, both spiritual and both theistic, though differing largely in their methods and their spirit. And between our modern philosophies of Nescience and Omniscience there exists a sober philosophy represented by men like James McCosh, that aims to give to all the facts of human consciousness their proper weight and to maintain the faith of those sublime intuitions by which we cognize the existence of the World, the Soul, and God. As in theology, there are a thousand questions yet to solve, and with regard to many that are fundamental there is still diversity of opinion among the best of thinkers. Yet still the priests of God and the priests of Baal are easy to distinguish from each other, and in philosophy as well as theology the cry may still be echoed: "If the Lord be God, serve him; but if Baal, serve him!" Nor was there ever yet a day when the signs of the times were more hopeful for a true philosophy. As error with

regard to the person of Christ reached its extremest results in both directions and exhausted itself in the first centuries of Christianity, so error in philosophy seems to have rendered this service for the truth, of showing to what heights and depths of folly and ruin a partial philosophy in either direction may lead. The day has dawned already in which philosophic investigation is carried on in the true inductive method and begins with the fundamental facts of consciousness — the intuitive knowledge of matter, of mind, of God, and of each as distinct and differing in nature from the others. Let a man hold fast to the deliverance that he has a face-to-face knowledge of the external world, of his own mind, and of the existence and presence of God, and he may defy all the arts of a false philosophy to lead him astray.

Just in proportion to the extent to which these fundamental convictions are ignored or obscured does fatal error creep into our reasonings. Philosophy is just beginning to settle her debt with Sir William Hamilton, who, with all his splendid contributions to a true science of the mind, still, by his notion of the relativity of human knowledge and his virtual denial of a direct knowledge of matter, left the door ajar for a subtle Idealism to enter and prepared the way for Mansel's resolution of the whole material of our religious faith into sheer contradiction. I know matter as something external to myself. I may learn a thousand things *about* it, but my knowledge of its existence can never be more perfect. To say that the external substance furnishes six of the twelve parts of my conception, while the organs by which I perceive it furnish three, and the mind itself three, is virtually to deny that we have any face-to-face knowledge of matter at all. And so to relegate our idea of the divine existence to the realm of faith, because, forsooth, any proper knowledge of God would require an apprehension of the manner in which his infinite attributes coexist to form one object is to deny one of the simplest facts of consciousness. There may be a thousand facts *about* God, of which I am ignorant, but my mind cognizes his existence and presence for all that. As another has said: "The African on the banks of the Niger may be altogether ignorant of its source and termination, but it would not be right on that account to deny that he has any knowledge of the river, and it would be equally wrong to deny that we can know God, merely on the ground that we do not and cannot grasp his infinite attributes." To tell me that this knowledge of God, "wherein standeth my eternal life," possesses no external validity, and to inscribe upon the temple of religion the legend, "To the Unknown God," is simply to sweep away the foundations of all knowledge. The clearness and power of this intuitive knowledge may be dimmed and blunted by sin. To see God revealed to my soul as distinctly as I see the forms of my fellow-men may belong to me only in those clearer moments to which here and hereafter the pure in heart may come, but still the fact remains that an intuitive knowledge of God, distorted, blunted, overlaid with a thousand superstitious fancies though it be, belongs to man as man, revealing itself in his consciousness of the Infinite around him and in his fears of the judgment before him. This conception of God is not the straining forward of the soul into an unknown abyss, as Kant maintained, nor is it a mere negation of all bounds and limits, as Hamilton fancied; for both these philosophers, in their constant declarations

that God is, and that he is a God of truth, declare in effect that, apart from all faith, they have substantial knowledge of God and of certain of his attributes. As "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding," the very height and glory of his nature is that he may look into the face of God and say: "My Father!" To waken this intuition into living power and to restore the actual communion of the soul with God, Christ has come, and in him who is "the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person" we who once were so involved in "the dark windings of the material and earthy" that we dared scarcely say, "we have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear," can declare with joy that "now our eye seeth Thee." This grandest intuition of the soul it is ours to interpret, to illustrate, to defend, by voice and pen, in heart and life. Men may mistake it and deny it, but its establishment upon a scientific basis is the test and the goal of a true philosophy. We may each do something toward the grand result, not only by the service of the intellect, but by living every day "as seeing Him who is invisible," and from our own certainty of the truth commending it to others. The noble lines with which Wordsworth concludes "The Prelude" set forth the preacher's work no less than the poet's:

> "Prophets of nature, we to them may speak
> A lasting inspiration, sanctified
> By reason, blest by faith; what we have loved
> Others will love, and we will teach them how;
> Instruct them how the mind of man becomes
> A thousand times more beautiful than the earth
> On which he dwells, above this frame of things
> In beauty exalted, as it is itself
> Of quality and fabric more divine."

Upon the side of the great entrance-hall of the Royal Museum in Berlin is painted a colossal picture of Kaulbach's, which unites more than any other picture in the world the interest of history and poetry, of weird imagination and symbolic lore. It represents that last battle between the Romans and the Huns, which decided the fate of European civilization. The story goes that the hosts on either side fought desperately for three long days, until the greater part of the combatants were slain, and the rest, worn out with the conflict, fell to the ground in heavy sleep. But as the night came on, the spirits of the slain, still fierce and restless even in death, rose from their bodies and held a still and awful battle in the air. This shadowy combat Kaulbach has painted. There, on the right, comes Attila, the "scourge of God," borne aloft upon a shield, and leading on his barbarians to death or victory. And there Theodoric, the Roman leader, advances to meet him, with sword in hand and the cross behind. The picture is wonderful for its vivid portraiture of deadly conflict, but far more for its symbolic teaching that the battle which determined the future of Christianity and of the world was not so much a battle of men and spears as a battle between the spirit of two opposing civilizations, a battle in which subtle and shadowy principles contended for the mastery of the world. So, brethren, let us never forget amid the practical noise and strife of our life-work, that above our heads another battle is going on, in which our struggling finds its only true significance. The battle of the ages is a battle of

principles, and he who has most possessed himself of the knowledge of that upper warfare will best conduct the fight amid the clang of arms and the shock of opposing battalions. Let us thank God that the issue is not doubtful. Though the armies of error are more subtle and more fierce than those shadowy barbarians that follow after Attila, the hosts of God are stronger still, for the Cross is with them, and by that sign they conquer!

II.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.*

The annual festival which brings us together marks the close of another year's professional instruction, and the completion by many before me of their whole preparatory training for the work and business of life. The friendships cemented by common pursuits and aspirations are soon to exist only in memory, and the hard tests of practical life are to decide how much of manly energy and sagacity and principle there is on which to build a permanent success. It is a noble profession to which you have bound yourselves. There is but one which can rival it in dignity. The three great learned guilds are one in their object, and one in their method of work. All have in view the good of human kind. All base their hope of good upon the study of God's laws. He must be a shallow and unworthy representative of the legal profession whose highest conception of it is that of a money-making trade, and whose mind, with all its matching of precedents and forging of arguments, never once finds in the law the dim reflection of God's eternal justice and truth. And he must be a sorry doctor who never loses sight of selfish comfort or reputation in disinterested service of humanity, and who forgets that in every case of disease that comes beneath his eye are illustrated the highest truths of God's great creation of mind and matter. The physician is brought face to face with the saddest and solemnest aspects of human life — he should be a wise and humble man ; he has piteous hands held out to him for help — he should be a man of tender human feeling, while he is yet careful and calm ; he must again and again see the soul hovering between two worlds and at last passing away like the spark of an extinguished taper, — he should be a truly religious man.

The great German dramatist puts into the mouth of one of his characters the words : "Respect the dreams of thy youth." I cannot believe that one of those whom I especially address is destitute of some such high ideal of professional beneficence and character. Yet at the same time you will not deem it unkind if I remind you that the dust of our life-struggle often obscures to us the lofty beacon-lights that guide our way ; and that, with all pursuits of natural science, Medicine shares the common danger of forgetting those spiritual facts which give to its conclusions all their validity and significance. Those whose occupation and principal study of life it is to adjust applications of the great laws of chemistry and dynamics, and who are exercised but little in subjects and fields of thought external to mere nature, come often to be practical unbelievers in anything but nature. Con-

*An Address delivered at the Commencement of the Medical College, Cleveland, February 18, 1867.

tinually occupied with the phenomena of the body and its effects on the mind, even the physician sometimes finds it hard to admit within his scheme of things anything supernatural or beyond the cognizance of the senses. The theologian is sometimes guilty of the opposite fault,— while nature and the supernatural together constitute the one system of God, he ofttimes ignores the results of science and decries her methods. Religion and science will never understand each other, or find terms of harmonious coöperation, until the great truth is recognized by each that observation and consciousness are alike sources of knowledge, and that equal validity is to be ascribed to the ascertained results of metaphysical and moral inquiry with that which we ascribe to the processes of natural research. It is my profound conviction that neither the scientific man nor the moral philosopher can achieve success in the building up of his own system, or in the symmetrical development of his own character, so long as either disdains the pursuits of the other. The two systems are complementary to each other, and each without the other is fragmentary and incomplete. The greatest possible heresy on the part of either is to play the empiric by assuming that its system comprises the whole of truth, and that there is no knowledge but that which comes through its peculiar method. Such partiality and egotism is foreign to the true scientific spirit. I doubt not, therefore, that your training here has favorably disposed you toward the theme which I desire to elucidate, namely, the indissoluble connection between physical and metaphysical inquiry, or what is much the same thing, the mutual dependence of science and religion.

My first proposition is that no system of thought deserves the name of true science which does not recognize the existence and importance of a realm of metaphysical, moral and spiritual truth, side by side with the great fields of physical inquiry. Though many are prone to deny it, there is such a thing as metaphysical science. The observation and classification of phenomena do not by any means comprise all that is possible in scientific research. By the word phenomena I mean here the phenomena perceptible to the senses. If used in the larger sense, which embraces all that occurs or reveals itself within the mind as well as without, the word phenomena may include within its scope all the raw material of our knowledge. There are phenomena of mind as well as of matter. Self-consciousness is as valid a source of knowledge as consciousness of the outer world. And it is the merest begging of the question for the Positivist to declare that only the phenomena of sense are to be recognized as of any value in scientific inquiry. The results of intellectual philosophy are just as real and valuable as the results of physical investigation, and to say that accepted moral truth has no other basis than faith, while physical truth is positive in any peculiar sense, is simply to deny the dicta of consciousness. Mental and spiritual facts are just as demonstrable, though by a different kind of evidence, as the facts of the visible and material universe around us. Let us strip away the mystery and prejudice that envelope that much-abused word, metaphysical. It means nothing but that which is beyond the sphere of the physical. For example, I burn my hand in the flame of this gas-burner. The gas, the flame, the disintegration of the tissues of my hand, are physical facts ; but do these comprise an exhaustive summary of the case? Some philosophers

would say so. But I fancy any man of common sense would feel called upon to put down certain other facts,— first, namely, a decided consciousness on my part that I was burned, and that I was a fool for putting my hand in the blaze. Now this perception of pain, this consciousness of folly, are not physical facts but metaphysical ones, and no one could ever persuade me that here was not a case for metaphysical inquiry. A similar test might be proposed for ascertaining the existence of human freedom and responsibility. If any man declares himself a fatalist, and assures you that human life and action are only unalterable links in the great chain of necessity that fast binds the universe,— suppose you knock him down,— the consequence is that he immediately rises up convinced of *your* freedom and responsibility, and considers these metaphysical facts at least, as sufficiently established, to warrant a process of law against you.

Upon such metaphysical facts science itself rests, and without them would be impossible. Science cannot proceed a step in her observations or demonstrations without assuming great truths which no experience has ever given her, and which she is obliged to receive by faith before she can set out at all on her voyage of discovery. Faith is a fundamental principle in philosophy just as much as in religion. You cannot get out of self to begin any investigation, without first assuming that you are different from the world around you, and that the faculties which assure you of the world's existence are truthful in their deliverances. Yet what evidence have you of these facts? None whatever, except that you have a nature preceding all your conscious thought, and underlying all your mental action,— a nature which your will did not create,— a nature which renders it impossible for you *not* to believe that your primitive cognitions are substantial verities. In the words of Fichte : " We are all born in faith." Faith in our mental powers as the sources of knowledge is a part of our nature. All science rests therefore, in the last analysis, on faith, not on the deductions of reason ; and the proudest contemner of religious faith builds his whole structure of knowledge on a basis of precisely the same character. And who can say that there may not be dormant in the soul the capacity of a higher faith, which divine influences may wake to activity, just as outward influences first wake to manifestation these other primitive intuitions of the mind? Who has a right to despise the edifice of religious knowledge, which equally with all scientific knowledge rests upon a foundation in the nature itself which all the storms of reasoning can never shake? And who will not see something more than mere poetry in those noble words of Tennyson :

> " Strong Son of God, Immortal Love,
> Whom we, that have not seen thy face,
> By faith and faith alone embrace,
> Believing where we cannot prove!
>
> " Thou wilt not leave us in the dust :
> Thou madest man, he knows not why ;
> He thinks he was not made to die ;
> And thou hast made him : thou art just."

Take the terms which science most uses,—" law," " cause," " order,"— and a slight examination will suffice to show that all their meaning and value consist in conceptions they derive from the realm of the metaphysical and spiritual. Suppose a case of acute disorder in the system comes under

your notice,—let it be a case of poisoning. You instantly inquire the cause, and you proceed to administer some agent to counteract the poison, or expel it from the system. But you could not do either of these without having in mind the idea of causation,—an idea which the mere succession of events never can give you,—an idea which is derived only from your own consciousness of power to produce effects in your physical organism,—in other words, from the metaphysical fact of will. And how could we know or love or seek order in the universe,—how could we begin to classify facts or reduce them to system,—if our own inward experience did not reveal to us a unity of being there, amid a multiplicity of manifestations? It is only the metaphysical consciousness of the oneness of self that leads us to seek unity in nature, or that enables us to interpret nature as a divinely constituted cosmos or order.

The absolute impossibility of ridding ourselves of these metaphysical conceptions is shown again and again in the involuntary slips of the pen by which those who deny the validity of all primitive cognitions are yet compelled to testify to their reality and to their silent presence through all the steps of their reasoning. John Stuart Mill, for example, though declaring in one breath that the very idea of cause is a delusion of the imagination and that we know only of the existence of fixed sequences in creation, is notwithstanding forced, when he comes to define "quality," to call it the cause of sensation, thus recognizing involuntarily the very metaphysical conception which he has been combating. And Comte, the French philosopher, while denying any validity to consciousness, is yet found saying that "man at first knows nothing but himself" and that "the phenomena of life are known by immediate consciousness." So impossible is it, if we build at all, to avoid building upon the solid ground of original intuition which underlies all our mental operations. You cannot even conceive of any material object, bounded as it is on every side and separated from other objects, except as existing in space, which is unbounded and includes all objects. You cannot think of any event as transpiring in time without at the same time conceiving of endless duration before and after, in which the event has place. You cannot help believing in infinite space and time,—you cannot even conceive of any limitation of them. Yet these infinite realities you never saw with your bodily eyes,—the conception came to you from the mind. And so you believe that every change is the result of power exerted somewhere and somehow; but this idea of causality is not from the world without but from the world within, and "without this action of mind upon its objects, the little world of man's knowledge would be not a cosmos but a chaos—not a system of parts having mutual relation to each other but an endless succession of isolated phantoms coming and going one by one."

Thus I would justify my first proposition, that no system of thought deserves the name of true science that does not recognize the existence and importance of a realm of metaphysical, moral and spiritual truth side by side with the great fields of physical inquiry. The facts of the one are just as important as the facts of the other, and however one's natural tastes may lead him to prefer one line of investigation to the other, he yet owes it to science and to himself to complement his knowledge of his own department

by the acceptance of ascertained results in the other, or at least by the recognition of another sphere whose exploration is as important as that of his own. The tendency of thought in all ages, however, has been toward one of the two opposite poles. Idealism and Materialism have alternately held sway, and the world, in the heat of controversy between them, has forgotten that the rounded globe of truth must have two poles, not one. There is truth in both, but either taken singly is false by defect. And while every man, as has been said, is born an Aristotelian or a Platonist, it is all the more important that the balance should be calmly held between the two. The fatal tendency to merge matter in mind or mind in matter, and so convert the universe into one substance, can only be counteracted by a study of both. Such study teaches us on the one hand that knowledge of external things can never be accounted for by resolving it into self-knowledge, for the latter is just as inexplicable as the former. We know self and we know the world, and we know that self is different from the world, and that is the end of all pantheistic idealism. But on the other hand the same study teaches us that self-knowledge can never be resolved into a mere phenomenon of matter; no muscular or nervous vibrations are identical with sensation or perception; and to call the high achievements of human reason the mere necessary products of blood and brain is beyond measure degrading to science and to the soul.

Yet to this the study of nature must lead us if it be not balanced by considerations from another department of knowledge. Nature alone gives us no conception of mind or of God, for it is different from mind or God. Let us pity the man whose whole scheme of nature has no room in it for those higher ideas which give nature all her grandeur and glory. "I can conceive a severe science," says F. W. Robertson in one of his letters, "compelling a mind step by step to atheistic conclusions; and that mind, loyal to truth, refusing to ignore the conclusions or to hide them. But then I can only conceive this done in a noble sadness, and a kind of divine infinite pity towards the race which is so bereft of its best hopes. I have no patience with a self-complacent smirk which says: 'Shut up the prophets; read Harriet Martineau and Atkinson. Friendship, Patriotism, are mesmerized brain; Faith, a mistake of the stomach; Love, a titillatory movement occurring in the upper part of the nape of the neck; Immortality, the craving of dyspepsia; God, a fancy produced by a certain pressure upon the gray parts of the hasty-pudding within the skull; Shakespeare, Plato, Cæsar, and all they did and wrote, weighed by an extra ounce or two of said pudding.'" This rough-shod criticism of a nobly indignant mind is a *reductio ad absurdum* of those conceptions of nature which would take out from it its very life and soul. When Buckle and Draper exhibit to us a list of statistical averages to prove that certain actions recur with uniform frequency in certain periods of time, they would have us infer that the free will of man is a mere figment of the imagination, and that the limits which are placed around human action reduce it to the law of necessity. They forget that, in the case they bring forward, law does not fetter the individual but only affects men in the mass. This is unlike gravitation, for gravitation acts equally and universally upon all matter. Every apple let go from the hand must fall, but not every man must act so and so. We infer from these

statistical averages merely that divine foresight has fixed bounds to human action, but that action itself is no less free within its sphere. The whole error of these physicists lies in their persistent determination to interpret the phenomena of mind by the conceptions they have received from matter; or in the words of James Martineau, "to push dynamics into the conquest of history and mankind, and to coerce the universe of life and persons into the formulas applicable to things."

While then any monistic theory is false, whether its leanings be toward Idealism or Materialism, and while it is true that both departments of human research must be included in any complete system of science, it becomes a most serious question which of these two co-ordinate realms shall furnish the interpretation for the other. After what I have said you will not be surprised to hear my second and last proposition, namely, that nature must be interpreted by our knowledge of mind, and not mind and its phenomena by our knowledge of nature; in other words, the governing conception in man must be also the governing conception in nature. Man has been well called a microcosm—a little world in himself—an image of the great world of matter and mind outside of him. It is this embracing in himself of the two that qualifies him to sit as judge of both; and his own being must be the measured segment of the arc, by which he triangulates the vast universe of being that stretches away on every side around him. The senses tell him of a physical organism subject to natural laws; but is this the whole of his nature? Ah, no! another inward sense tells him of the possession of endowments totally different in kind from those of matter. He has mind; there are in him life, knowledge, will, conscience,—and nature has none of these. Now, of these two parts of a man, which is the dominant one? I know that there are men like Emerson to affirm that man is here, not to work, but to be worked upon. I know that there are men like Youmans to suggest that by mere transformation a force, existing as motion, heat, or light, can become a mode of consciousness; and that emotions and thoughts are simply another form of forces which are liberated by chemical changes in the brain. But in reply to this theory, which in its tendencies is purely materialistic and atheistic, we have only to bring forward the evidence of consciousness, that testifies clearly that mind is not subject to the laws of matter, but that it holds sway over these and can bend these to its purpose. Man conquering nature is the very idea of modern civilization. I do not mean that any one of nature's laws can be changed at his caprice, but I mean that man has been endowed with the power to put those laws in new combinations, and so make them his slaves to do his bidding.

A single act of man's will may set in motion a train of natural operations which never could have occurred without his agency, and yet which continue working of themselves after he has withdrawn his hand. To use an illustration of Janet's: "I kindle a fire in my grate. I only intervene to produce and combine together the different agents whose natural action behooves to produce the effect I have need of; but the first step once taken, all the phenomena constituting combustion engender each other conformably to their laws without a new intervention of the agent, so that an observer who shall study the series of these phenomena, without perceiving the first hand that had prepared all, could not seize that hand in any special act, and

yet there is a preconceived plan and combination," and the whole series of effects may be traced back to the action of one mind and will. So Diman has well said that "when laws are conceived of, not as single but as combined, instead of being immutable in their operation, they are the agencies of ceaseless change. Phenomena are governed, not by invariable forces, but by endlessly varying *combinations* of invariable forces;" and we may add that while these combinations are to a considerable extent in the hands of man, so that by combining the laws of chemical attraction and combustion he can fire the gunpowder and split the solid rock asunder, these combinations are to an unlimited extent in the hands of God, so that, without suspension of natural laws but rather through these laws, he can interpose to produce providential or even miraculous results in nature, which nature left to herself would never be able to accomplish.

What I contend for, then, is simply this: that while nature's laws are rigid, there is a power superior to those laws and exempt from their control, namely, the power of the personal will — and that in this will of man we have an instance of an efficient cause in the highest sense of that term, acting among and along with the physical causes of the material world, and producing results which would not have been brought about by any invariable sequence of physical causes left to their own action. We have evidence, in fine, of an elasticity in the constitution of nature, which permits the influence of human power on the phenomena of the world to be exercised or suspended at will, without affecting in the least the stability of the great system of things. If I throw a stone into the air, its *fall* is determined by natural laws, but can any man say that my *throwing* it was the mere result of natural laws? Nay, my free-will, something above nature, has done it, nor has any law of nature been violated therein.

In this conception of personal will we find the only key to the interpretation of nature. We talk about the forces of nature — or about the different forms that force takes on — magnetism, light, heat, motion, — but what do we know about force itself, except by our own consciousness of power exerted in every act of will? That is the only force of which we have immediate knowledge, and we know it to have its centre and source in our own personality. And so when we see a change in nature we instantly attribute it to the exertion of some unseen power, — the very laws of our mental constitution forbid us to conceive of that change as blind and causeless. There is force everywhere in nature — the moving world in all its successions and changes is bound together by some all-pervading force, which, assuming different forms, produces life and beauty and order. But our minds refuse to rest in this idea of force — we cannot even conceive of it except as having its source and centre in a personal intelligence and will analogous to our own. The very same faculties whose veracity guarantees the existence of the outward world guarantee also the existence of One whose wisdom shapes that world and conserves its being and brings about its regular successions from day to day. The universe is not a great machine self-erected and running its endless courses by virtue of some blind tendency to self-development. There is no real power that has not its seat in mind, and every change in the relations of matter is evidence of the presence of a superintending wisdom and of a divine will that upholds all things by its word. And so,

instead of asserting with some of our modern physicists that the highest law of all science, the most far-reaching principle that adventuring reason has discovered in the universe, is the conservation of force,— we may with greater reverence say that science itself, in its highest sense, points to a principle high above all force and all the laws of force, namely, the personal will of the omnipresent and omnipotent God.

We recognize accordingly, in our own consciousness of will-power and in our own experience of its exercise, a clue to the explanation of the world without us, its forces and its origin. But there is another fact in our mental operations which sheds yet further light upon the meaning of nature, and that is our consciousness of purpose. We not only work, but we work toward ends. In ourselves, we recognize not only the principle of cause, but also the principle of final cause. I am myself convinced that the belief that all things have their ends is a primitive and universal one; that this alone gives a rational unity to the whole system of things; that this alone renders induction possible. I can argue from one thing to another only upon the assumption that things in the universe correspond to each other; in other words, that each has been made to fill its place in the system, that each exists for a purpose. But whether it be a primitive belief or not, it is at any rate a working principle of all science. Science could make no progress, indeed could make no beginnings, if she did not take for granted that there must be adaptations and uses in things whose purpose and design have hitherto been hidden.

There are two ways in which this rational interpretation of nature is sought to be refuted. The older and fortunately now somewhat antiquated method, of which Comte was the representative, is that of denying that there is any such thing as purpose in nature. What once seemed marks of design are called accidental coincidences. Final causes are merged in the totality of efficient causes. But later writers have felt the necessity of recognizing the principle of finality in nature, of ends toward which the universe and its various parts are working; — yet they are unwilling to grant that there is a superintending wisdom which at all answers to the Christian idea of God. The result has been the announcement of the principle of immanent finality, of unconscious intelligence. And to this second interpretation of nature a large part of our modern scientists are inclined to give in their adhesion. They point to the instinct of the bee which builds its hexagons and provides its winter store without consciousness of the end its labor is to subserve. They point to the unconscious formation of language—a whole people for centuries shaping and perfecting a vehicle for thought—yet without consultation with each other or understanding of the harmonious structure which they are rearing. They point to the work of the world's greatest geniuses in music and in literature, and claim that the perfection of art is characterized by spontaneity, absence of forethought, in short, unconscious intelligence. So they would have us believe that the spirit that moves and works in the universe is also an unconscious intelligence, and that the marvelous results of order and beauty which we see about us are but the unpurposed ends toward which an impersonal force has been working.

There are very many arguments which might be urged against this con-

ception of nature, but we can notice only one. It loses sight of man. It is the universe that is to be accounted for, and the theory expressly holds that man is a part of the universe. If there were no such thing as conscious freedom and conscious purpose anywhere, if animal intelligence were the highest, then there would be nothing so impossible in the hypothesis that undesigning creatures were an outgrowth of undesigning intelligence. But the moment that man is taken into the account, we have a problem which this philosophy can never solve — the problem how the conscious is to be explained from the unconscious. It is granted that there is intelligence in nature; it is granted that there is conscious intelligence in man, and that this conscious intelligence is higher than that which is unconscious. We claim that it is more rational to explain the lower by the higher, than it is to explain the higher by the lower — more rational to suppose that unconscious intelligence has derived its origin from conscious intelligence, than that the conscious has come from the unconscious. If nature has an intelligent cause, you are bound to get your ideas of the nature of that cause, not from the lowest forms of intelligence you know, but from the highest — not from the animal, therefore, but from the man. In our own intelligent purpose we have the simplest explanation of the intelligence of the universe about us. Somewhere or other you must find purpose outside of man to explain purpose in man — and when you have found a conscious intelligence that can explain man, you can best explain the unconscious universe by referring that to this intelligence also. An organism working unconsciously toward an end can be best explained by supposing that it is impelled toward that end by another being who is conscious and who has chosen the end. It is only reason to suppose that nature reaches her ends because nature is ruled by a being immanent in nature whose intelligence has determined the ends and whose power realizes them. Leave out man and the universe cannot be rationally interpreted. Include man in your survey, and you are bound to regard nature as the product and working of a mind and will analogous to the conscious soul that inhabits and energizes and directs the human body.

I have said that, if we include man in our survey of the universe, we are bound to regard nature as the product and working of a mind and will analogous to the conscious soul that inhabits and energizes and directs the human body. Deny this, and I do not see what is to save you from denying also the fact of conscious intelligence in man. To this the theory I am combating logically tends. We have no physical evidence of the existence of consciousness in others. As our fellow-beings are declared destitute of free volition, so they should be declared destitute of consciousness. As the brutes are called automata, so should man be called an automaton. It has well been said that if physics be all, we have no God, but then also we have no man, existing. If we deny that the adaptations in nature are indications of a designing God, we should equally deny that the watch, the aqueduct and the railway are indications of a designing man. "The essential bestiality of man" is a natural and logical conclusion. Into this Slough of Despond, this renunciation of the highest honors of manhood, the philosophy of the day is drifting. "What the bearing of the automatic theory of human nature," I quote from a late essay of Mr. Goldwin Smith, "what the bearing of the automatic theory of human nature would be upon the hopes and

aspirations of man, or on moral philosophy generally, it might be difficult, no doubt, to say. But has any one of the distinguished advocates of the automatic theory ever acted upon it, or allowed his thoughts to be really ruled by it, for a moment? What can be imagined more strange than an automaton suddenly becoming conscious of its own automatic character, reasoning and debating about it automatically, and coming automatically to the conclusion that the automatic theory of itself is true?"

Tennyson answers, in effect, the question of Goldwin Smith, and the answer is despair and suicide :

"Why should we bear with an hour of torture, a moment of pain,
If every man die forever, if all his griefs are in vain,
And the homeless planet at length will be wheel'd thro' the silence of space,
Motherless evermore of an ever-vanishing race,
When the worm shall have writhed its last, and its last brother-worm will have fled
From the dead fossil skull that is left in the rocks of an earth that is dead?

"Have I crazed myself over their horrible infidel writings? O yes,
For these are the new dark ages, you see, of the popular press,
When the bat comes out of his cave, and the owls are whooping at noon,
And Doubt is the lord of this dunghill and crows to the sun and the moon,
Till the Sun and the Moon of our science are both of them turn'd into blood,
And Hope will have broken her heart, running after a shadow of good."

And so we feel bound to protest against the doctrine that the unconscious is the measure and the source of the conscious, and that final causes are only unphilosophic dreams. Mr. Darwin himself has conceded that upon his view there is no reason why the progress of life upon the planet should be toward higher rather than toward lower forms. Upon this theory there is no explanation of the moral order and sanctions of the individual life, nor of the moral purpose that is visible in human history. Evolution itself, as involving uniform progress, implies an ordaining wisdom. Evolution, indeed, is only a mode of divine action, not in conflict with design, but a new illustration of it,— a method of securing a result, and so the latest and best proof a designing God.

When once we have settled the truth that nature is to be interpreted by our knowledge of mind, and not mind by our knowledge of nature, we have the intellectual foundation of all true religion. Mind, and not matter, presents to us the truest image of God. The universe is governed not by physical so much as by moral laws. Final causes precede efficient causes. There is an end which controls the choice of means. Now we are prepared to see the marks of design which meet the candid eye everywhere in the universe. Now we can see eternal wisdom in every leaf and twig, in every sand-grain, in every breeze, in every sunbeam. No longer do we look upon the system of things as a ship constructed and launched by its builder and now given over to the sailors to navigate. No longer do we feel compelled to banish the great Architect to some far-off corner of his dominions, while the vast structure of the world is left to itself, and the races of men pursue their fated course to glory or ruin. Rather than bear the terrible burden of such a godless universe,

— "I'd rather be
A Pagan, suckled in a creed outworn;
So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,
Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn;
Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea,
Or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn."

But better than Paganism is the faith to which a true science leads us. It teaches us that "the universe," in the words of a French philosopher, "is a thought of God." It teaches us that the living presence of God is all around us, and that in the great events of history, as well as in the changes of the natural world, there is a wisdom that sees the end from the beginning, and orders all things with reference to that "one far-off divine event, toward which the whole creation moves." In one of his hasty dispatches from the field of Waterloo, the Duke of Wellington wrote: "The finger of Providence was upon me!" And there are moments at least in the lives of all of us, when we turn from the iron pressure of the world's unvarying laws with a burden upon us. The gigantic mechanism of the universe cannot soothe or quiet the questionings of the intellect or the agitations of the soul. Trouble and care, the responsibilities and failures of life, make us long to feel that some great divine Heart is at the centre of the sublime system, and that infinite Wisdom and Power can sympathize with us and give us rest.

Then it is pleasant to see how nature, interpreted by that which we find within ourselves, gives us assurances of a divine and fatherly care. Professor Cooke, of Cambridge, has drawn a most ingenious and convincing argument from the nature and adaptation of the chemical elements of which the physical universe is composed. Grant that the world is merely the result of development from a nebulous fire-mist, revolving and condensing and throwing off red hot satellites and suns,— still the chemical constituents of that fire-mist — oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, and all the elementary substances — existed then as now, and the evidences of design in their original adaptation to each other are as strong as the evidences of design in the completed creation. God's goodness and wisdom alone can account for even this original constitution of the elements as they existed in chaos. But when we look up to the heavens above us, and see what mighty forces are required to cover a continent with its wintry mantle of snow, and to send the showers of the skies upon the just and unjust,— when we look beyond our atmosphere, and consider what vast powers of gravitation must be ever active to keep our planet in its true relations to the solar system and the stellar worlds above, we feel that the presence of God must be as inseparable from the movements of the universe as the figure of Phidias on Minerva's shield, which could not be erased without spoiling the whole composition. And if this be the true conception of nature, then how rational it is to go further and say that this personal Will that moves all and preserves all, is not fettered by nature, but is the master of nature. Nature is but the manifestation of God, and the laws of nature are only the fixed methods of His working. He orders and governs the universe, not for its own sake, but for the revelation of Himself. Reason, love, conscience, purity, these are the ends for which we live,— they must be the ends for which God lives. And if we can accomplish our designs, by forming new combinations of natural laws and inserting among them the force of our own personal wills, how elastic and pliable must this constitution of things be in the hand of God! Miracles are not impossible unless God is impossible,— they are not improbable unless we deny his moral attributes,— they are not false unless we deny his word, and put beneath our feet all the laws of human testimony. Allow only a sufficient end to be gained by their performance — the authenti-

cation of that very revelation which nature makes only imperfectly — and miracles become not only possible but natural. It was fit that the great bell of the universe should sound, when the Author of nature came in human guise to proclaim deliverance to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind.

As you go out then, graduates of this college, into the great suffering world, to be ministers of mercy to the sick and dying, I would charge you to be something more than devotees of your profession, something more than men of science, — I would have you also men of faith. For faith is nothing more than the acceptance of God's testimony on evidence as accessible and as valid as that on which we accept the reality of outward phenomena. Such faith is no infirmity of the soul; on the other hand, it confers the only title to true symmetry and strength of character, as well as to the broadest and highest attainments in knowledge. Let intellect and heart go together, let physical and moral science be united, let knowledge and religion both combine to make character strong and success sure. What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. Mere intellectual culture is only a part of the great sum of a perfect manhood.

"What is she, cut from love and faith,
But some wild Pallas from the brain

"Of demons? fiery hot to burst
All barriers in her onward race
For power. Let her know her place:
She is the second, not the first.

"A higher hand must make her mild,
If all be not in vain; and guide
Her footsteps, moving side by side
With wisdom, like the younger child;

"For she is earthly, of the mind,
But wisdom heavenly, of the soul."

III.

MATERIALISTIC SKEPTICISM.*

The unbelief of the present day is a stream with many eddies, but its general drift and direction are plain. Twenty years ago, the transcendental idealism of Hegel threatened to sweep away the faith of the world. By a natural and perfectly explicable reaction, this has given place to the mechanical philosophy of Feuerbach and Büchner. Or to put it more accurately, the change from Hegel to Büchner in Germany is but the type of a universal change in the tendency of skeptical thought. It needs no long search to discover occasions and helpers of this change. The growth of material interests in these modern days, the progress of physical research, the inventions that have opened new mines to industry and new lands to trade, have disposed the unreligious to a Sadducceism which holds this world to be all, and believes in neither angel nor spirit.

Not that materialism is always openly avowed. It constitutes the staple of thought in many a professed description of physical facts, and in many a literary work whose apparent aim is simply to depict life and the development of character. The philosophy of Comte and Bain and Herbert Spencer, the natural researches of Darwin and Tyndall and Huxley, the historical studies of Buckle and Taine, and the romances of Auerbach and George Eliot, alike, though in different degrees, reveal this materialistic spirit and show how widely diffused and how dangerous it is. It not only gives color to a large part of the literature of the day, but it too often tinges the thinking of medical men, and enters as an unconscious element into demands for radical reform in our methods of education. It gets possession even of philanthropists and theologians, leading the latter to make out of Providence and Redemption only one vast system of natural law, and leading the former to confound evangelization with civilization, and to deny the possibility of permanently changing, except by physical means, the innate and persistent types of character in either individuals or nations.

It is this general tendency of modern literature and life which Christianity must now meet and, if possible, correct. The danger is great only so long as it is undefined. We may define the danger, by defining the system which gives rise to it. Materialism is that method of thought which would make all things, even intelligence and volition, to be mere phenomena of matter. It holds that the universe can be explained without bringing in the notion of a designing mind — without bringing in the notion of any immaterial principle at all — explained from the mere natural properties of

* Printed in the Examiner, October 2, 1873.

the atoms and forces which constitute it. Stripped of the hazy rhetoric in which it is so frequently enveloped, and reduced to a bare definition, materialism loses its novelty as well as its beauty. We descry in it the features of an error long since slain and buried. Five hundred years before Christ it was propounded by Democritus, and two centuries later all its essential principles were elaborately set forth in that Epicurean philosophy which the great apostle met and overthrew on Mars' Hill.

What a history this theory of the universe has had! Rising evermore in periods of national and social declension, it has been the product and the sign of spiritual and moral decay—an *ignis fatuus* which springs from death, and which lures to death. No nation in its sturdy youth has ever had any other than a spiritualistic philosophy. No age given over to materialism has ever shown creative genius or noble statesmanship. Epicurus marks the time of Greek corruption and debasement, when the deepening darkness was making negative preparation for the rise of Christ's new light upon the world. Condillac and Diderot, D'Alembert and D'Holbach, repeating the Epicurean philosophy in the 18th century, mark in like manner that time of godless passion and sensual idolatry which culminated in the French Revolution.

But every prevalent and plausible falsehood has its grain of verity. Let us give materialism its rights, and allow the small truth which it contains, else we shall not understand it nor its power; much less be able to frame a radical and conclusive answer. Materialism does right in insisting upon the substantive existence of the properties of matter and upon the persistence of natural forces. It utters a useful, though not the most successful, protest against the Idealism which would deny the objective existence of the external world, and the semi-pantheism which would make all force to be the simple volition of God. Let us acknowledge, then, once for all, the existence and the powers of matter—these we cannot deny without denying our senses and intuitions alike. The universe is not a drama whose shifting scenes display only one actor—God; other powers have been ordained and other agents created by him; there are physical powers as well as mental, blind forces as well as intelligent; and the observer of nature, as he looks upon the complicated movements and relations of elements and worlds, need never for a moment fancy them a deceptive show—they are a sublime reality. But then they are not the sublimest of realities. It is the fundamental error of materialism to think them so. To the view of a true philosophy, there lies back of all these a superior energy, an originating cause, a designing intelligence, an upholding power, whose greatness and wisdom they dimly reflect, but can never fully express; in other words, the existence and working of the material elements is not an ultimate fact which furnishes its own explanation; much less can this explain the higher forms of life which appear upon the planet; reason can never be satisfied without postulating an immaterial existence and a personal power in which these inhere, and from which they derive their being—an existence and a power infinitely higher, yet analogous in nature to that which we find in our own minds and wills—the existence and the power which we call God.

Materialism may be refuted by considerations drawn from three different sources, the facts of matter, the facts of organization, the facts of mind.

Let us look at these in their order. First, then, matter furnishes no proper cause for the universe or for any of its phenomena. Think for a moment what is meant by cause. The cause of any given phenomenon is not simply the antecedent of that phenomenon. The night is the antecedent of the day, but darkness is not the cause of light. Nothing is properly a cause which has not power as well as antecedence. Reason is not satisfied without attributing every known change in nature to some power which produced it. The materialist cannot justify his position unless he can show that his philosophy accounts for the existence of the universe. He, with us, is compelled to assign some origin and source to external things, but he finds that origin and source of all things in matter. We urge against this theory of the universe that the materialist is bound to furnish not simply a cause, but a sufficient cause, for this complicated mechanism and structure which we see without us. Matter is no such sufficient cause for the universe. For what is matter? This we may certainly say, that apart from its sensible qualities and from force, we know it only as existence, extension, permanence. It is plain then that matter, as matter, cannot be shown to have the properties of a cause. Only as some power from without shall possess it and use it, can it become a cause,—and then not matter, but this power from without, is properly the cause in question.

But the later materialism adds to the notion of matter the notion of force. This force is conceived, of course, as a mere property of matter, since to make it a separate and independent existence would be, for the materialist, to give up the theory of matter as a cause, and to make shipwreck of his materialism altogether. But can force be, as the materialist holds, only an inseparable property of matter? It is sufficient to say that the fact of inertia disproves this. No body ever moves of itself. It remains in a state of rest forever until impressed from without. We do not, indeed, know the nature of gravitation. Newton conceived of it as an impulsion *ab extra*. But whether it be what Newton imagined, or an attraction of every molecule from within, the case is not altered—we get no nearer to an inherent power of motion. Only as one portion of matter is acted upon by another, can it move toward that other. The motion of matter is due, not to matter itself, but to some external cause. In other words, adding to matter the idea of force, does not render matter a sufficient cause for the least motion in the universe, much less a sufficient cause for the universe itself. The motions of matter, and the adjustments of material bodies to each other, so that they draw forth each other's powers and work together harmoniously toward useful ends, can only be accounted for by supposing an immaterial force—a force which is itself no property of matter.

This force must be a mental force. And that, because we find ideas in nature, and ideas are the product solely of mind. Why is the spoken word significant to men? Why is it different from the whistling of the wind? Simply because, from the analogy of our own speech, we infer that it has a cause in the mind of another. Vibrations of air do not explain it, because it contains an idea. We cannot explain a beautiful picture by making an inventory of the colors of the canvas. We see an idea in it. We see a mind behind it that once conceived and expressed that idea. So to a right-thinking soul the universe is a spoken word, a harmonious picture. The material

elements of which it is composed do not explain it; something more than matter is there; there is mind, and the universe is the expression of that mind. Or, to sum up in few words this portion of the argument: Since matter is neither self-existent nor self-acting, whether in the molecule or the world, it can never be regarded as a sufficient cause or explanation of the present system of things; supplementing the idea of matter with that of force does not help the difficulty, since whatever force is inseparable from matter still leaves each portion of matter inert and dependent upon impressions from without; to attribute to this force the properties of a first cause is to make it a force apart from matter and above matter, and such a force can never be conceived as other than the energy of a conscious spirit, a spirit that can create matter and work upon matter, but which has no necessary connection with matter, and which the facts of matter can never explain. In short, the facts of matter show that matter can never explain its own existence or adjustments; they show the rather, that it evermore points upward to a causative and mighty Mind.

A second argument against materialism is derived from what we may call facts of organization. There are phenomena of organic life which can never be explained except upon the hypothesis of an organizing force superior to matter. Assimilation and reproduction, growth according to definite plan, preservation of form notwithstanding changes of substance, capacity of self-repair, these characteristics of plant and animal life are in themselves a reversal of all laws belonging to matter as such, whether those laws be mechanical or chemical. Effects so special and peculiar demand a special and peculiar cause — and this cause we denominate life. It has indeed been sought to define life as a mere quality of matter. But if life were a property of protoplasm, as aquosity is a property of water, protoplasm and life would be inseparable. We know, however, that in the dead animal protoplasm may exist without life. The mutton which the materialist eats might convince him of his error, for here is protoplasm of which life is not a property. On the other hand, the living protoplasm has a structure and power which chemistry cannot account for, any more than it can account for the peculiar build and the marvelous achievements of a printing-press or a reaping-machine. To account for this structure and this power we must presuppose not only chemical and mechanical forces, but also a force utterly different in its nature, and as superior to these forces as its results are superior to theirs. The force that dominates matter and subdues it to its purposes must be, not a material, but an immaterial energy.

And here again we meet the ever-recurring fact of ideas in nature. The life of the animal and of the plant reveals a rational unity, a tending of all its forces to an end, a working out of a plan, a striving for completeness of organization and use. And as in the life of the individual plant or animal, so in the long history of life upon the earth since the geologic ages began, we discover a unity and harmony which reason refuses to attribute to the blind action of natural forces. The stream cannot rise higher than the fountain. The system whose order so delights the reason must have had for its source a designing intelligence; in other words, must have sprung not from matter but from mind. Even if the materialist could by his chemistry actually produce living plants or animals from inorganic materials, the argu-

ment we urge would not be invalidated, since the production of such forms of life as geologic history displays, and their production in such order and relations, demands still a designing and adjusting mind that adapts the elements to each other, and prearranges the course of their development.

But this origin of life from inorganic elements is a pure assumption of which science knows nothing at all. No single attested fact as yet substantiates it. So far as we know, life originates only from preëxisting life. It is never the result of organization, but always the cause of organization; never the product of protoplasm, but always something superinduced upon it. You may look in vain to mere nature for its parentage. Go back a thousand million years, and matter can furnish the source and explanation of it no more than now. You must either attribute its existence on the globe to some meteoric accession from other planets of the system — and this merely pushes back the problem without solving it, — or you must acknowledge that life sprang originally from an immaterial source, from one who has life in himself — and that is the same thing as to say that materialism is false, since the fundamental superior originating thing in this universe is not matter, but Mind.

Materialism is disproved, finally, by the facts of our own being. Our intellectual nature gives testimony against it. For there is much in this intellectual nature which never could have come from matter. The materialist holds that mental energy is only one of the correlated physical forces, and that thought is but transformed sensation. We might answer that it is essential to the very idea of physical force to be susceptible of measurement by physical tests. Heat is a mode of motion, say the scientists, and therefore the force expended in any given combustion may be expressed in actual pounds-weight. But who shall weigh thought or feeling or volition? Love cannot be measured by bushels, or weight of thought estimated in avoirdupois. But wherein consists the absurdity of this, if mental action is but the product of impressions from without?

The fundamental error in this materialistic reasoning is that of supposing the mind to be a mere tablet on which circumstances and sensations make their marks, whereas the mind is active instead, in all its knowledge, and gives quite as much as it receives. The single fact of attention shows this. It depends wholly upon the consent of the will whether we receive impressions from passing objects or not. A man may have flowing into his ears all the noises of a crowded street, and yet be as unconscious of them as if he were in silence and solitude. Into what sort of mental energy are all these multitudinous sensations transformed? Or if we ask, with a late writer, into what physical force the brain power of the dying Shakespeare was converted, what answer can be returned? The truth is, it is impossible to account for the power of thinking by any combinations or vibrations of material atoms. Thought may in the present state be connected inseparably with such affections of our physical organism — although even this is exceedingly difficult to prove — but this connection is not identity. Because the organist produces the fugues of Bach only by touching the keys of his instrument, we do not conclude that instrument and organist are one, and that that one is the organ. Thought and the motions of matter are not mutually convertible. We may not only say with Tyndall that "the passage from the physics of

the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable," but we may also say that to derive the latter from the former is a reversal of all logic.

If the physical could be proved to produce the psychical, the materialist would have proved his doctrine. But the latter produces the former as much as the former the latter. In order to sense-impressions there must previously exist a mind to be impressed. As Professor Gardiner has said: "Most of the properties of matter have no meaning where there is no mind to perceive them. There is no audible world without the ear; there is no visible world without the eye. What is accessible to the senses is not the only reality. Mind gives to matter its chief meaning. Hence matter alone can never explain the universe." And Robert Browning, that "subtlest assertor of the soul in song," says nothing more worthy of himself than when, in "The Ring and the Book," he puts into the Pope's mouth the words: "Mind is not matter, nor from matter, but above."

We are asking whether mind is a sublimated form of matter? What does the mind itself say with regard to this question? This simply, that it is radically and essentially different from matter. Amid all the changes of the material world around it, and amid all the changes of the material organism of which it makes use, the mind is conscious to itself of being one continuous and identical existence. In and with every act of sense-perception is bound up the mind's knowledge of itself as an undivided unit, inconceivable as occupying space or as measurable by any material standard. While the mind is conscious of dependence upon the senses for knowledge of the outer world, a large part of its knowledge, and that the noblest part, is its own original and native endowment. The ideas of substance, of space and time of cause, of right, of God, are not the gift or product of experience. Experience may occasion their rise in consciousness, but there is more in them than experience can ever explain. And as with its knowledge, so with its higher activities — these are independent of any known physical conditions. No materialist has ever yet shown that the abstract thought of any great philosopher or the fervid imaginings of any great poet could be accounted for by changes of molecules in the brain. There is such a thing as an originating activity in the human spirit. Affections of the mind, such as love, hope, fear, influence the body more than the sensations of the body influence the mind. The mind knows itself as superior to the body — not its creature and slave. It can resist the body and subdue it. Instead of ceasing to grow when the body ceases to grow, the mind only then enters upon its noblest growth. Instead of becoming weak and helpless as the body fails in strength, the mind not seldom shows then an unflagging brilliance and energy. And when the frail body is near to dissolution, the mind feels most its immeasurable superiority to all material things, and triumphs in the very article of death. The materialism that would degrade man to a cadaver finds all the voices of our intellectual being uniting in one solemn protest against it.

But the protest grows more loud and plain when we consult the moral nature. If we know anything at all, we know that we are free. We know that we have the power to originate action, and to choose between right and wrong. But matter is incapable of originating action. Upon the materialistic theory, free will is impossible. The materialist is a necessitarian. Huxley shows us the logical outcome of the theory, when he declares that a

spontaneous act is an absurdity, since it is an effect without a cause. But mark the result. If the human will be not a cause, then it belongs in the category of things determined wholly from without. Human responsibility ceases, and with this all just foundation for law and morality. Conscience is at once annihilated, for if conscience be a modification of matter, then it is mechanical, not moral, and this is the same as to say that it does not exist. What yet remains of remorse and apprehension in the mind of the transgressor is but a subjective delusion, having no objective rule in the universe of things to justify it, and no future account to render its decisions worthy of the slightest regard. Man is what his nature and his circumstances make him. He may resolve and pray as he will, but the forces of the universe are persistent and they overmaster him. We may look with sympathy upon men laden with tendencies to evil, but there is no power to recreate and save — that is, no power except the distant and slow-working forces of inheritance, climate, and social condition. Why labor for the welfare of creatures of clay, over whose perished bodies "ashes to ashes, dust to dust" will soon be said, but all hope of resurrection be wanting? James Martineau, in the autobiographical preface to his "Types of Ethical Theory," expresses not only his own experience but the experience of many others, when he says: "It was the irresistible pleading of the moral consciousness which first drove me to rebel against the limits of the merely scientific conception. It became incredible to me that nothing was possible except the actual. * * * Is there then no *ought to be*, other than *what is?*"

Materialism gives up and must give up the immortality of the soul as an egoistic reverie, since the mind must die with the body whose movements constitute it. It is said of Robert Hall, that he buried his materialism in his father's grave. As he looked into the gulf that was just about to swallow up forever all that was left to him of that wise mind and tender father's heart, the son shrank back. He felt that the tomb was too narrow to contain so much. He felt that whatever might become of the body, the soul was fashioned in a different mould and must live on forever. But the highest hope of the materialist, as he lays mother or child in the dust, is that the body may manure the soil and pass through endless changes into other forms of conscious or unconscious life. And we little realize how much of this paganism is abroad to-day. The same hopeless spirit of Epicurean fatalism which breathed through all the later age of imperial and decadent Rome is breathing in much of our literature to-day. It finds its fit expression in the maxim of Feuerbach: "*Man ist was er iszt* — Man is what he eats." Expressed or unexpressed, visible or invisible, it is the subtle spirit of materialism, which declares the human body to be only a weedy outgrowth of the primeval slime, the soul to be only a congeries of highly developed and subtly connected atoms, and immortality to be only the eternal procession of the body's disintegrated elements around the great circle of chemical change. Such a view as this inevitably reduces philosophy to physiology, ethics to mechanics, and the law of God to a bill of fare.

Does it need to be said that, logically, this is Atheism also? Can there be no such thing as spontaneity? Then there is no freedom for God any more than for man. Must we deny the existence of everything which we cannot weigh in scales and handle with the forceps? Then we must not only grant to the materialist that there is no such thing as mind, because, forsooth, the

anatomist cannot lay it bare to sight with his cerebral dissecting-knife — we must also grant that there can be no such thing as God, because, forsooth, the astronomer cannot see God through his telescope. May we not say of materialism, as a final and conclusive indictment, that the facts of our religious nature disprove it? We have in us and with us, as our inmost possession, the knowledge of God. Try to escape it as we may, it underlies all our reasoning and conditions all our life. In times of awakened conscience, when the tempest rages, or death draws nigh, this inward witness to God's existence and moral character stands out like the handwriting of fire on Belshazzar's palace-walls. To this God our very nature compels us, in spite of ourselves, to look, as the proper rule and end of life, the true rest and portion and reward of a human soul. Materialism, by depriving us of God, would deprive us of all that can make the present tolerable, or the future other than an object of terror. If all things in the universe be only phenomena of matter, then not only is there no spirit in man, but the idea of a supreme Spirit in the universe is the wildest of imaginations. All worship or upward looking of the soul is foreclosed forever. The heavens are deaf to human entreaty. In man's sin and sorrow there is no eye to pity and no arm to save. The highest wisdom is to live upon the maxim, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

> "I trust I have not wasted breath:
> I think we are not wholly brain,
> Magnetic mockeries; not in vain,
> Like Paul with beasts, I fought with Death;
>
> "Not only cunning casts in clay:
> Let Science prove we are, and then
> What matters Science unto men,
> At least to me? I would not stay."

Thus we see how a whole system of thought, originating in a desire after scientific unity, becomes dogmatic and thoroughly unscientific, by attempting to refer two classes of phenomena to the same ground, when it cannot logically resolve one into the other. To honor matter by denying mind is to falsify the facts. To elevate God's ordinance of second causes into the chief place, and make them play the part of the Great First Cause, is logically suicide, since in denying the fundamental and superior fact of spiritual existence man logically denies his own existence, and opens the way to utter skepticism.

And yet the logical refutation of materialism is not the only one, nor the most practical. A better refutation is the sense of sin in the soul, inexplicable except there be freedom and God. A better still is the person of Christ, inexplicable except it be a new breaking in upon the sinful history of the world by the power and grace of Him who first created it. He who well ponders his own nature and his own lack of harmony with the moral law revealed in conscience, will see depths in his own being which a material theory of its origin can never explain, and which only Christ, the Son of God, the all-sufficient Saviour, can ever fill with light and peace. To Christ then we commend the candid inquirer. Let him go to Christ, to Christ himself, and be "taught in him, even as truth is in Jesus." He who is "able to save even unto the uttermost," will save him, even from these uttermost depths of materialistic skepticism.

IV.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF EVOLUTION.*

I count it an honor to speak to these hearers and in this place. Those whom I immediately address are preparing to influence their time by the force of ideas. The place is hospitable to ideas,—the world's thought, whether new or old, finds a focus here. Protectionists did wisely in their generation when they sought to stem the rising tide of free trade by securing the colleges. But it is not so much for its services to science that I value the University. It is because every University is a well-spring of philosophy —a teacher of those fundamental principles which underlie all science, as well as all literature, jurisprudence, morals and civilization. Therefore, I feel the responsibility as well as the honor of speaking here. And I can best discharge this responsibility, as it seems to me, by directing your attention to a new philosophy, which makes imposing claims upon our allegiance, which is the current sensation of the decade, and which, if accepted, must work great ultimate changes, whether for good or evil, in our methods of thought and life. I propose to you a consideration of what, in America, has been called the Cosmic Philosophy, or what is more generally known as the Philosophy of Evolution.

I speak of this philosophy as the intellectual sensation of the decade, for not ten years have passed since it made its way to the front. It is not wise to be moved from our critical attitude by the flourish of its trumpets and the seeming weight of its onset. The student of philosophy knows that each decade has its new pretender to the throne of thought. "Our little systems have their day. They have their day and cease to be." Old men among us look back to the time when the reigning philosophy was that of Locke and Hume. The men of middle-age before me remember how that philosophy was attacked and seemingly overthrown by the transcendental idealism of Germany, and how this last became, in turn, the bugbear of orthodox thinkers. We of a younger sort know well that the ghost of transcendentalism has been laid these many years. In its place we have seen rise upon the scene the portentous form of French positivism with its contemptuous denial of causation, and beyond the Rhine the accompanying gross materialism of Büchner, who, like a revived Lucretius, deifies blind atoms. And now that positivism has lost its prestige and power, it is only natural that the generation just entering upon active life should see still another claimant to the honors of the field. It is the scheme which we examine to-night. At first glance the new system seems better armed and

*An address delivered before the Literary Societies of Colby University, Tuesday evening, July 23, 1878.

equipped than any of those which it has superseded. But closer inspection reveals the fact that this equipment is largely made up of spoils taken from these very predecessors. In truth, the new philosophy is an attempt to combine the plausible elements of all the four systems that have gone before; or, in other words, to rehabilitate the sensational method of Locke and Hume in certain discarded robes of the later idealism, while positivism furnishes the facts and materialism the spirit of the whole.

Yet we would not willingly underrate our opponent. Under the constructive hand of Herbert Spencer, this philosophy has a sweep that comprehends the universe. Resources of advanced physical science, such as Locke and Hume never knew, are marshaled in its defense. And to these Mr. Spencer adds a faculty of popular exposition such as no preceding thinker of his ability has possessed. When we grant that he has brought out into strong relief, though he has not discovered, a certain truth of development too much ignored before, we allow to his system certain notable elements of power. But all this is so much the worse if the system, in its essential features, is false. This we desire to show, both as respects the assumptions upon which it proceeds, and as respects the method in which its principles are applied.

As Mr. Jevons has well shown, the Baconian method had its origin, not with Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam, in the sixteenth century, but with Roger Bacon, friar and philosopher, in the thirteenth. This whole method was a recoil from that of the Greek philosophers which the scholastics had perpetuated. The Greek philosophers had assumed certain causes and then had inferred what the effects must be. Give them fire or air or water, and out of them they would construct the existing universe. The Baconian philosophy cast contempt upon all this and taught the world that the only true method of science was to proceed, not from causes to effects, but from effects to causes. First facts, then explanations; observation and induction, the instruments of knowledge; progress ever from the known to the unknown —these were its fundamental principles; and if human knowledge since that day has made progress such as the ancients never dreamed of, it has been because modern investigators have followed these principles in their labors. Now, the first count in our indictment of the philosophy of Evolution is this, that it ignores this settled organon of investigation and attempts to deduce the existing universe by purely necessary laws from an assumed original somewhat, the existence and nature of which is undemonstrated and indemonstrable. That the deductive element, rather than the inductive, is the determining characteristic of the scheme is an offense against modern science, and raises a presumption against it at the start. When Mr. Spencer tells us that if we will grant him the single indubitable truth of the persistence of force, he will show us how nebulæ and suns and planets and rocks and plants and brutes and men and histories and civilizations and literatures and philosophies have been necessarily evolved, we seem to be hearing Anaximander over again as he tells us that all things come from infinity— a principle universally diffused and devoid of all qualities which can be described or known, and which is to all intents and purposes equivalent to nothing, endowed with the power of generation, and we turn with relief to the words of Tait, a greater scientific authority than Spencer, when he says:

"No *a priori* reasoning can conduct us demonstrably to a single physical truth."

I must not be understood as objecting to the Cosmic Philosophy so called simply upon the ground that it makes use of an *a priori* principle, for all systems whatever are obliged to take for granted certain *a priori* principles; indeed, without assuming the existence of space and time, the necessity of a cause for every change, and the validity of the common laws of thought, we could not observe or reason at all. What I have thus far objected to is this, that the Cosmic Philosophy, instead of using its abstract fundamental principle as purely regulative, commits the scientific enormity of deriving the whole concrete universe therefrom. This reasoning from the abstract to the concrete, instead of depending for knowledge of the concrete upon observation and induction, constitutes it a purely *a priori* scheme of the most vicious kind. Mr. Spencer's method would be a wrong one and its results delusive, even if the fundamental principle from which he deduces his scheme were true. But I urge against it a still more important objection: this fundamental principle is not simply undemonstrated and indemonstrable; it is false — false by defect. Add what is necessary to make it true, and no such system of evolution can be based upon it. We are asked to postulate at the beginning simple force, abstract and blind, and the necessity of its persistence. Now we grant the mental necessity that compels this assumption, provided only we be allowed to state the full content of our belief. That belief, fully expressed, is nothing less than this: There is an endlessly persistent will-force. For we know nothing of force at all, except through, and upon occasion of, the exercise of our own wills. In the outward world our senses perceive change, but they do not perceive power. I might look forever upon the sweep of the tempest and the rolling waves of the ocean without inferring that the tempest produced the waves, if it were not that I have within me the experience of effort and of effect produced by effort. I will to raise my arm and strike a blow. In that willing there is direct consciousness of force and its outgoing. If my arm is in a normal condition, the arm is lifted and the external effect is produced — the hammer rings on the anvil; but the stroke of the hammer is not force, and the muscular tension of the arm is not force; these are but indications and effects of force; the anvil may fail to be struck, and the arm from sudden paralysis may fail to strike, but force may still exist and be consciously exerted back of all these, though it be exerted in vain. In short, we know force, not as something perceived by the senses, but as something intuitively cognized by the reason. We know it as the inseparable correlate of effort; as always implying will; in the very conception of force there lies, latent if not expressed, the idea of conative and active mind. We feel compelled, with Mr. Spencer, to postulate force as behind and before all things; but then it is force that has its origin in will; and if it be an endless, universal and infinite force, then a force proceeding from an endless, universal and infinite mind. Force cannot be defined or conceived except in terms of will; and if, as Mr. Spencer declares, our conviction of the persistence of force is "deeper than demonstration, deeper even than definite cognition, deep as the very nature of mind," then we demand that the fundamental principle of his philosophy, false by defect hitherto, be enlarged

to take in the full compass of this intuitive deliverance of reason, and that he build his system henceforth, if he can, upon the broader truth that, as the ultimate basis and explanation of all things, there exists and persists an infinite source of energy whose nature is conscious intelligence and will.

The central reason why he truncates this most fundamental of our knowledges until it becomes a torso without sign of life or reason will very soon appear. Let us at present notice the objection which he urges against regarding force as always implying an exercise of will. It is simply this, that upon this view we must consider the muscles of the arm not only, but all external things in nature, as having each its separate consciousness. When you lift a chair from the floor, he would say, you are bound upon your theory to maintain that the chair is as conscious of the force of gravitation which draws it down, as your arm is conscious of the nervous tension which holds it up. Not so, we say. Both the chair and the arm are middle terms, and neither are properly conscious. Both are the instruments of force. The arm communicates and gives effect to a force which does not originate in the arm, and of which the arm is not itself conscious. It is the *ego*, the mind, that puts forth the force, and is conscious of the strain. So the chair communicates and gives effect to a force which does not originate in the chair, and of which the chair is not conscious. But the mind and will, of which gravitation is the uniform expression, may be supposed to be conscious of each particular instance of its application, unless indeed we be anthropomorphic enough to fancy an infinite mind as not sufficiently capacious to embrace such details without perplexity, and an infinite will as not sufficiently powerful to make such multiplied efforts without weariness.

But the moment we perceive clearly that force is simply a manifestation of will, and has will for its inseparable correlate, we see at once that the persistence of force means the persistence of will. And will is necessarily free. Here then is an incalculable element, at the start, which threatens ruin to any theory of the universe that would explain it as a necessary development of blind forces existing from the beginning. We see at once how important it is for Mr. Spencer to exclude this will from his system. Admit it, and what trouble may it not work — to Mr. Spencer! God is not so easily harnessed, and will not draw so steadily on the evolution-track, as will these perfectly calculable forces. But how is it that force has become forces? A moment ago we had the persistence of force, and the peculiarity of this force was that it was abstract, indefinite, intangible. Suddenly it has become forces, definite forces of attraction, and very inconsistently as it would seem, of repulsion also, and these wonderfully adapted to each other and to the production of matter and motion with the whole universe of things that result from them. Ah, there is but one explanation of it! If forces had been talked of at the beginning, it would have been too plainly seen that they do not necessarily persist. Only the absolute force — which we have seen to be identical with, or correlative to, infinite mind and will — only this absolute force persists of necessity, while what we call forces are mere manifestations of this self-existent force, and may persist or not as the will in which they have their origin may direct. So Mr. Spencer gets the advantage, to his theory, of investing blind forces with the unchangeableness of the God whom they manifest, while yet the creative will and designing wis-

dom of God are set aside. There is a certain truth, indeed, in the doctrine that forces persist; but then it is a mere relative truth of induction, not an absolute truth of philosophy. *How far* it is true is to be determined, not from our inner consciousness, but from observation and testimony. In all ordinary cases, and for all common purposes of life, the forces of nature are unchangeable. But no law of necessity ordains their uniformity. The will which they manifest to-day may abolish them to-morrow. It is only the infinite will which they manifest that necessarily persists. And that persists not necessarily in action external to itself. It might conceivably exist for whole eternities absorbed in thought and activity of which there should be no outward manifestation whatever. Infinite will need not manifest its whole power. God can all that he will, but he will not all that he can,— else God is the slave of his own omnipotence. He is a great God, and in that limitless mind and unfettered will which constitute the only necessarily persisting force, there are fortunately some things that are not dreamed of in Mr. Spencer's philosophy.

Allowing, however, that force can exist, and can be differentiated into forces without implying will or design, we have still to see whether matter and motion can be derived from mere force. We maintain that this cannot be done without denying that matter is matter and that motion is motion. All we know of matter in the last analysis, it is said, is that it resists or that it presses. Boscovitch concluded that the only proper conception of matter was that which regarded it as consisting of mere centres of force. But how can there be pressure or resistance where there is nothing that presses or resists, and where there is nothing that is pressed or resisted? We see clearly that, unless we accept the purely idealistic hypothesis that nothing really exists but sensations and impressions, we must affirm that over against the mind that has the sensations and impressions there exists an external matter that produces them. Impressions without something that impresses and something that is impressed, sensations without something that has sensation and something that causes sensations, are figments of the imagination. In reality, we know the external thing perceived, and the conscious *ego* that perceives, in the same concrete act in which we cognize the internal fact of perception. We know the existence of external matter with the same certainty as we know our own existence. But a philosophy which resolves matter into mere force must make it a purely subjective thing, internal and not external to the mind. It must believe in impressions without anything to make them, and resistance without anything that resists, and this is the principle of absolute idealism. And this pitfall Mr. Spencer's philosophy cannot escape, except by being utterly inconsistent with itself and admitting a principle of realism which will destroy it. No, let us say it out so plainly that none can mistake,— matter is matter, and not the mere feeling of it, and if it be something really external to the mind, then neither force nor forces can account for it, and much less produce it. And yet without matter force has nothing to work with, and is unavailable for the purposes of evolution. Is it not easy to see that a Creator is required, before even Mr. Spencer's forces can build up a universe? When we perceive with Professor Cook, of Cambridge, that the elements, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon, are wonderfully adapted to each other in their original constitution, and with

Professor Clerk Maxwell, of England, that the indivisible atoms in their absolute uniformity bear all the marks of being "manufactured articles," can we not say that the theory of Creation is an infinitely simpler and more credible one than that of the chance development of matter from the action of loose forces in the empty void? But then, if matter was created, it may be destroyed, and what then will become of the great principle of the indestructibility of matter which forms so natural a corollary to the persistence of force? Ah, that is Mr. Spencer's quandary, and not ours! To us who believe in creation, the indestructibility of matter is no *a priori* and necessary truth, as it seems to Mr. Spencer, but only a relative truth, the limits of which are to be determined by observation and experience. The same God who creates can also destroy.

So with motion. This, too, is called a mere manifestation of force. But can we be sure that, even with force and matter on hand at the outset, continuous motion will necessarily follow? What is meant by inertia? Is it not this, that matter is not self-moving? Surely one portion of matter cannot move another portion without a previous adjustment of the one portion to the other. And so to the magnificent scheme of development suggested by Laplace—development of the universe from a primeval tenuous mist of atoms, drawing together, and so revolving, and so heating, and so intensifying and liberating its latent forces until chaos turns to cosmos — we only reply that force alone cannot explain motion. Force may be only latent, or it may draw all matter to a common centre of blackness and death, or it may involve matter in boundless waste and confusion. If the universe consisted of a single atom, however richly endowed with force, it would never move at all. As matter is inexplicable without creation, so motion is inexplicable without adjustment. For the operation of force there is requisite, plurality of atoms and relation between them. And this relation can be constituted only by mind; above all, motion that shall evolve anything is impossible without coördinating intelligence. That nebulous matter moved at all, and especially that it moved so as to produce, even after vast cycles of time, the order and beauty of suns and stars with their measured orbits and their mutual influences, this has its root in purpose and plan, not in mere force without prescience or wisdom. No cosmos is possible without a plan, and while we should have only praise for Mr. Spencer in this portion of his researches, if he were setting forth the method of divine working, we can feel only reprobation for a scheme which makes so large a place for matter and motion, but which has no place for mind.

Thus far we have criticised only Mr. Spencer's general method and the particular *a priori* principles upon which his philosophy is founded. To follow him minutely in the practical application of these principles would be an almost endless task. Yet every system must be finally tested by its applications. Does it actually explain the facts? We maintain that Mr. Spencer's scheme not only does not account for the most critical and important of these facts, but is compelled either to ignore them or virtually to deny them. I shall try to show its defects in three important features: 1st, as an explanation of the origin of life and mind; 2dly, as a theory of human knowledge with regard to truth and God; and 3rdly, as a basis for scientific and practical morality.

1. You are aware that the Mosaic record recognizes both creation and cosmogony. It recognizes the present order of things as the result, not simply of an originating fiat of God, but also of subsequent arrangement and development. A fashioning of inorganic materials subsequently to their creation is described, and also a use of these materials in providing the conditions of organized existence. Life is depicted as reproducing itself, after its introduction, according to its own laws and by virtue of its own inner energy. The earth brings forth and the waters swarm; the tree has seed in itself and the animal creation is self-multiplying. But although this principle of development is recognized in Genesis, as Origen and Augustine and Anselm perceived many centuries ago, yet it has not been allowed its full weight by the interpreters of Scripture. They have been so impressed with the unique declarations of God's absolute Creatorship that they have not sufficiently attended to the accompanying declarations of subsequent evolution according to natural law. It is this last principle which Mr. Spencer has made the characteristic of his system; but the principle is not only as old as the church-fathers,—it is as old as Moses. We thank him for emphasizing a truth too much neglected. But we charge him with narrowness in excluding from his scheme the greater truth that in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. His philosophy demands this truth for its supplement and explanation, but, since it is a truth which could come only from revelation, he will none of it. How is it that the Hebrews alone of all nations had the idea of absolute creation? We find no trace of it in classic times. With the heathen, there were only eternal processes of birth or growth from something pre-existing,—the question as to origination none attempted to answer. Science could never have informed the Hebrews, for science was not. Physical science can observe changes, but it knows nothing of origins. As Sir Charles Lyell has well said: "Geology is the earth's autobiography—but no autobiography can give account of the birth of its subject." But what science cannot give, revelation did give to that least scientific nation of ancient times. They knew of God, the Creator of the very substance of the universe. They knew of development, but they knew also of an originating act of God by which this development was prefaced, and of successive manifestations of divine power by which this development was supplemented.

We are ourselves evolutionists then, within certain limits, and we accept a large portion of the results of Mr. Spencer's work. We gratefully appropriate whatever science can prove. We have long ceased to respect the objection of Leibnitz to the Newtonian law of gravitation. We know that gravitation does not take the universe out of the hands of God, but only reveals the method of the divine working. So, the day is past, in our judgment, when thoughtful men can believe that there was a creative fiat of God at the introduction of every variety of vegetable and animal life. God may work by means, and a law of variation and of natural selection may have been and probably was the method in which his great design in the vast majority of living forms was carried out. But what we claim is that no law of mere evolution can furnish an exhaustive explanation of the facts. There are outstanding problems which this philosophy can never solve. The origin of life upon the earth—the beginning of organic existence,—

this is utterly beyond the powers of Mr. Spencer's calculus. For Bastian's theory of spontaneous generation there is not a shadow of scientific warrant, and Sir William Thomson's method of bringing in a vegetable germ hidden in the cleft of some meteorite from the stellar spaces is too manifestly a shoving-back of the difficulty to some other sphere, where he cannot well be followed, to merit anything better than ridicule. Again, when we come to the origin of mind this philosophy is utterly at fault. It can show that psychical processes are always accompanied by physical processes, and that mind and body are mutually dependent in the present state of being; but it has never made an approach to proving that consciousness is transformed physical or nervous force, or that thought is a mode of motion. Indeed, the fact which Mr. Bain brings out so clearly, namely, that when thought begins there is not the slightest break in the line of physical sequences, and that when thought ends there is no perceptible addition to the sum of the physical forces of the universe, is conclusive evidence that the physical and the psychical are not mutually correlative. But if mind cannot be got from matter, still less can man be got from the brute. His possession of general ideas, of self-consciousness, of a moral sense, and of free self-determination — in short, his personality — cannot have been derived by any process of development from the inferior creatures. Even if his body were descended from some primitive simian ancestor, his soul cannot be; for the differences between man's soul and the principle of intelligence in the lower animals, as Wallace has shown, are differences, not of degree, but of kind, so that there is no explanation of his lofty and complex being but that of the Scripture: "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." But, last of all, there rises before us the form of the living Christ — a new beginning in human history, not to be explained from His Jewish antecedents — transforming human nature because He transcends human nature — and as we gaze upon Him we are compelled to confess the new-creating power of God. These three — organic life, the human soul, the realized ideal of manhood in Christ — these three owe their origin, not to processes of natural law, but to direct interpositions of God. Even if all the remaining history of the planet, from primeval fire-mist down, could be explained on principles of development, here are three great facts which cannot be so explained. The Philosophy of Evolution meets Life, in its three typical forms, as Œdipus met the Sphynx of ancient fable; and since the Philosophy of Evolution cannot solve the riddle of Life, it must confess itself vanquished, and yield itself to death as gracefully as it may.

So we add to the truth of Creation, which ensures God's independence and sovereignty, the other truth of Superintendence, which is inseparable from his omnipresence and control. He is in the universe while he is above it, — immanent while he is transcendent, — able to work upon occasion by direct exercise of will, while his ordinary method of working is through natural law. And, without taking into account this superintending care and wisdom, none of the great assumed facts of evolution would be credible or rational. The rotation of the nebula, inexplicable except by some impact from without; the heat-producing condensation of the diffused mass, in spite of operative forces of repulsion; the origin of the varieties which natural selection finds ready to its hand, and the most useful of which it

only preserves ; the beauty of insect-wings and of diatom-markings, so much of which could serve no purpose of utility, because unseen by any eye but God's ; the progress of life along a line of gradual improvement, instead of along a line of gradual deterioration, such as Mr. Darwin declares to be equally possible upon his theory ; the history of human civilization, and the gradual overbalancing of sensual instincts by the force of moral ideas,— all these things are indications that something more than force, groping blindly to its ends, is at work in the universe ; all these things are explicable only upon the view that there is a thinking mind, a loving heart, an ordaining will, who superintends the forces of matter and of mind, and directs them to the accomplishment of a plan of far-reaching wisdom. But such a view can find no standing ground upon the premises of the Cosmic Philosophy. It is denounced as anthropomorphism — an unmanageable pseud-idea that has no claim to respect. We see no reason why Mr. Spencer should be unwilling to endow his all-originating force with the attributes of mind and will, unless it be this, that he knows too well that, if he puts intelligence and freedom in at the beginning, he will be obliged to recognize them when they come out at the end. But this he cannot do, and adhere to his system. It is essential to that system to regard the universe as consisting only of one substance, of which matter and mind are equally manifestations. Now we cannot give up the natural dualism of our ordinary thinking, without calling mind matter, or matter mind. Mr. Spencer chooses the former alternative. To him mind is matter. At least it is conceived and construed under physical analogies, and the priority of thinking and willing spirit is denied. And so, having no mind at the beginning, he can have none at the end. Mind is really resolved into the motion of material particles, and man is logically reduced to an automaton. So monism convicts itself of folly. Its conceit of wisdom ends in degrading man, instead of exalting him. This is worse than the fate of Ulysses' companions, for Circe's cup only turned men into swine,—this philosophy makes them machines.

2. What estimate shall we place upon Mr. Spencer's theory of knowledge ? Can the human mind cognize truth,— can we reach reality ? If not, philosophy would seem the vainest of vain pursuits. But, if we are to have knowledge at the end, we must have knowledge at the beginning. The child whose study of the alphabet should lead him to the conclusion that A was probably A,— but then, it might also be B, or it might be nothing,—would surely have a very insecure basis for his future attainments. If I do not know with absolute certainty that I think, that I exist, that my faculties in their normal action do not deceive me, how can I possibly know any of the other things that are built upon these foundations ? But now comes Mr. Spencer, and assures us that nothing can be absolutely known. The 'relativity of knowledge '— misleading and fatal phrase, borrowed though it be from Mansel and Hamilton — is a very watchword of this philosophy. All knowledge, it is said, is a very watchword of this philosophy. All knowledge, it is said, is relative to the knowing agent ; that is, what we know, we know, not as it is objectively, but only as it is related to our own senses and faculties. The conclusion is drawn, that there is ever a subjective element in what we call knowledge, which vitiates it and robs it of its certainty. Now we regard this whole method of representation as a most reprehensible mystification

of the truth. We grant that we can know only that which has relation to our faculties. But this is only to say that we know only that which we come into mental contact with, that is, we know only what we know. But we deny that what we come into mental contact with is known by us as other than it is. So far as it is known at all, it is known as it is. In other words the laws of our knowing are not merely arbitrary and regulative, but correspond to the nature of things,— they are laws of thought because they are laws of things. Upon the opposite principle, man's search for truth is the boy's search for the pot of gold at the foot of the rainbow. Who will search for truth, if there be no truth to be found? Every elaborate philosophy like Mr. Spencer's is a practical refutation of the relativity of knowledge. It must contradict itself, indeed, to maintain a moment's existence. As another has put the words into Mr. Spencer's mouth, so we may quote them: "All knowledge is, not absolute, but relative. Our knowledge of this fact, however, is not relative but absolute!" Therefore it is not absolutely true that all knowledge is relative, and Mr. Spencer's theory of knowledge falls to the ground.

Now the truths which we must know as the conditions and foundations of all other knowledge are of the class called *a priori*. Space, time, substance, cause, design, God — these are cognitions incontrovertibly prior to all others. They cannot be derived from experience, because without them no experience is possible. They cannot be derived from reasoning, because all reasoning, inductive as well as deductive, is founded upon them. And yet they are not things perceived by the senses — they are cognized by the mind. Sense occasions them, but does not account for them. Plato thought them reminiscences of things apprehended in a previous state of being. We see that they are part of the original furniture of the reason, which experience draws forth from latency into power. The mind is not a *tabula rasa* at the start, but is so constituted that upon occasion of cognizing body it necessarily perceives that body to exist in space; upon occasion of cognizing succession, it necessarily perceives that succession to exist in time; upon occasion of cognizing qualities, it necessarily perceives the existence of substance in which qualities inhere and find their unity; upon occasion of cognizing change, it necessarily perceives that change to be due to some producing cause or power; upon occasion of cognizing order and useful collocation pervading a system, it necessarily perceives this to be the result of design; upon occasion of cognizing finiteness, dependence and obligation, it necessarily perceives the existence of an infinite and independent being, to whom obligation is due. These truths do not come to us as the result of observation or inference, because both observation and inference presuppose them. You could not observe the dispositions of matter, without the prior idea of space. You could not conduct any process of inference, except upon the tacit assumption of a designing intelligence which has so put things in relation that you can argue from one to the other. There can be no science of the merely relative. What we call law is something utterly imperceptible to the senses. Mere successions and coëxistences give no relations — the senses perceive no connecting link between external facts,— and science is the pursuit of relations, not the cataloguing of facts. And a philosophy that ignores or denies these *a priori* cognitions of the human mind, not only

forfeits its claim to be called a philosophy, but opens the way for a thorough-going and boundless skepticism; for if the mind's testimony to these most fundamental of all truths be cast away as worthless, then no other knowledge, however plausible it may seem, is worthy of a moment's confidence.

Mr. Spencer's treatment of this most important matter is ingenious in the extreme. Positivism, with its denial that we can know anything but the phenomena of sense, is too bald a misrepresentation of the facts of consciousness. Mr. Lewes's idea that the mere recording of facts is philosophy, and the only philosophy, does not satisfy the aspirations of so great a thinker as Mr. Spencer. We cannot deny that there is an *a priori* element in our knowledge which the acquisitions of no single lifetime can explain; each man finds himself in possession of ideas, the origin of which he cannot trace to his own observation and experience. Now, the new system professes to recognize the *a priori* element in all human knowledge, while yet it shows this *a priori* element to have been derived from the sense-experiences of past generations. It is transcendental for the individual, but empirical for the race. Well, let us be thankful for small favors from Mr. Spencer's school! Even this is an advance on John Stuart Mill, who denied that we had any reason to believe even the axioms of mathematics to be valid in other worlds than ours, and according to whose view two parallel lines might possibly enclose a space in the star Sirius, and three times three make ten in Orion. Such an attempt, as this of Mr. Spencer, to make peace with the intuitionalists, shows that the intuitionalist artillery has done some execution within the enemy's lines. None the less is it true that the peace proposed is a hollow and delusive one. No peace is possible except upon surrender of the sensationalist position. Mr. Spencer assumes, provisionally, the validity of these *a priori* truths, only that he may the more effectively argue them out of existence. And he can do no otherwise. He must assume these necessary laws even in his argument to show that they are not necessary. We propose to him, therefore, a dilemma. Either these assumptions are true, and then his argument against them must be false; or, these assumptions are false, and then the argument which is built upon them is false, likewise. In either case, as has been said, he plants his battery over an adversary's mine, and is hoisted at his first fire.

What is gained by carrying back the origin of these ideas to past millenniums, when the demand for explanation is the same even there? Of what avail is it to call them the results of past experiences of the race, when the first experience presupposes them and is impossible without them? The first experience of individual positions of external matter logically presupposes the knowledge of space. The first act of self-consciousness or judgment presupposes memory and the knowledge of time. They cannot be an outgrowth of successive inductions of primitive man, for the first induction was impossible without the assumptions of cause and design and the implicit acceptance of all the laws of logical reasoning. Mr. Spencer tells us that all cognition is really recognition; but when we ask how, then, there could be a first cognition, he mumbles something about gradual growth and slowly accumulating impressions,—but there is absolutely no explanation of the first fact of actual attention or observation or memory or judgment or rea-

soning. In truth, nothing so clearly shows Mr. Spencer's ignorance or evasion of the real question at issue as his treatment of the intuitions. To him, they are not different in essence from the accumulated force of association in the brute; to him, there is as much in the dog to be accounted for as in the man. We do not envy him his view of the human mind, although we can easily see how his philosophy corresponds to it. It is a good philosophy for the brute, for it is a plausible explanation of the brute's psychology; but self-respect forbids our accepting it as a philosophy for man. It is easy to see that, however much regard Mr. Spencer may think it politic to pay to the intuitions at the outset of his investigations, they are left with but sorry claims to respect at the end of his investigations. All knowledge is proved to be only transformed sensation, and these *a priori* knowledges among the rest. And, now that we know just what they have come from, we can judge of their weight and validity. Here is much that sensation cannot justly give. Let it be regarded, therefore, only as provisional and regulative truth; in other words, let us give it as little credence as we can, and as soon as possible let us get rid of it altogether. So the realism with which Mr. Spencer begins turns out to be an exceedingly transfigured realism. In fact, when we hear him saying of consciousness that it "contains no element, relation or law that is like any element, relation or law in the external body," it seems to be hardly distinguishable from idealism. And here Mr. Spencer belongs. He is an idealist, though a materialistic idealist. Dr. Carpenter can say: "That whatever thinks exists, is known to us as a necessary *a priori* truth by its own evidence; but that I myself exist is known to me, not by evidence of any kind, but by consciousness, to be a particular contingent fact of supreme certainty." But Mr. Spencer cannot consistently say this. That the external world exists, or that spirit exists within, must be upon his principles problematical. He and his school are Humists. The soul, to them, is but a screen for shadows, or rather a mere succession of shadows without any screen, though it passes knowledge how they can be certain that even the shadows themselves exist.

The chief evil of this system of philosophy is, however, that it shuts out all knowledge of God. It claims to be far more reverent than orthodox religionists, in that it abstains from all sacrilegious endeavors to describe or define that which is essentially and forever unknowable. The force which is manifested in the processes of nature it declares to be beyond human conception, and what is inconceivable must be unknown. Now, we admit that we know only that of which we can conceive, if by "conceive" we mean our distinguishing, in thought, the object known from all other objects. This we claim we can do with respect to God. We distinguish him, as the infinite Spirit, Love and Holiness, from every other being whatever. But, by "conceive," Mr. Spencer means something entirely different from this, namely, to form an adequate mental image. He confounds conception with that which is merely its occasional accompaniment and help — the picturing of the object by the imagination. This is an erroneous use of the word "conception," and, taken in this sense, conceivability is by no means a final test of truth. The formation of a mental image is not essential either to conception or to knowledge. As a matter of fact, we both conceive and

know many things of which we cannot form a mental image of any sort that in the least corresponds to the reality. We know our own minds; but who can picture to himself the form or substance of that which he thus knows? We have a conception of space, in the sense that we can distinguish it in thought from the body that fills it, and from the time in which that body moves; but who can figure space in his imagination? The mind possesses the body; the soul is present, there is reason to suppose, in every part of the body at once, even as God is in every part of his universe — *totus in omni parte* — but who can image the soul under spatial relations? Yet, certain of these unpicturable things are positively known to be true. To conceive is not to picture; and, therefore, the fact that we cannot form an adequate mental image of God is no proof that we cannot conceive of him or know him. The truth is that Mr. Spencer's test of inconceivability is not only false in itself; he applies it arbitrarily, and at times surrenders it altogether. For example, the idea of a self-existent and infinite mind and will is rejected because, in Mr. Spencer's sense, it is inconceivable. Mr. Spencer allows that the force, of which all things are manifestations, is equally inconceivable; but, in spite of its inconceivability, he accepts the idea of it as the most primitive and fundamental of truths. Such a test is a convenient one — it will admit Mr. Spencer's God, but will shut out every other man's.

But the stock-objection to theism employed by the philosophy of nescience is that God cannot be known, because to know is to limit or define; hence, it is concluded that the Absolute as unlimited, and the Infinite as undefined, cannot possibly be known. But we reply that such an infinite and absolute as Mr. Spencer has in mind is a mere abstraction and chimera, — it is not the being for the knowledge of whom we are contending. To this being the most fundamental of all attributes is that of perfection; all other attributes are qualified by this. A God incapable of movement or revelation is not the God of whom we speak, nor have we in mind a God who can be all things evil as well as all things good. God is absolute, not as existing in no relation, but as existing in no necessary relation. No relation is imposed upon him from without. If he enters into relations, he does it by virtue of a self-determination from within; and if he continues in these relations, he does it in perfect freedom. So, God is infinite, not as excluding all co-existence of the finite with himself; for a God who must in the nature of things be the sole being, cut off from all communication of himself to others, is laden with imperfection and impotence. God is infinite, then, as being the ground of the finite, and so unfettered by it. He is, therefore, a being so limited and defined as to render knowledge of him possible. Indeed, it is not irreverence to say that in his own moral nature and unchangeableness he is the most limited being in the universe; but that he cannot lie or sin or die is his perfection and glory. Here, too, Mr. Spencer rejects theism upon grounds which should compel him to reject the doctrine of force also. For, while he declares that by becoming cause God would cease to be absolute, his unknowable force becomes cause without impairing its absoluteness in the least. "But if it can be cause without ceasing to be absolute," says an able critic, "why can it not be known without ceasing to be absolute? So, too, if everything known is a form of the unknowable, the unknowable

is modified, and the absolute or unmodified unknowable has no existence. But if the absolute can be modified without ceasing to be absolute, why can it not be known without ceasing to be absolute?" We can then know God in relation, and this is the only God we wish to know or need to know. And all this Mr. Spencer practically confesses when he confers upon his Unknowable so great a number of definite and characterizing appellatives. One cannot even call a thing unknown and unknowable without showing that he already knows one thing about it, namely, that he does not know it and that it cannot be known. But how great the compass of one's knowledge must be when he is able to speak of this Unknowable, as Mr. Spencer does in various places, as the one, eternal, ubiquitious, infinite, ultimate, absolute existence, power and cause! Here are nine separate designations, and with the term "unknowable" we have ten. It is absurd to say that an Infinite and Absolute that can be thus described and defined is beyond the sphere of human knowledge.

Mr. Spencer's quarrel, however, is chiefly with the idea of personality. This he would extirpate as a self-contradictory and meaningless notion when applied to the power that moves in nature and in mind. The uniformities of natural order, he would say, negative God's personality; in other words, absolute regularity of action excludes the possibility of intelligence and freedom. But is this true? Do we call the capricious variability of childhood the best evidence of purpose and wisdom? On the other hand, do we not find that increasing maturity always brings with it increase of system? Are not the wise man's actions the easiest to predict? What is this but to say that the more perfect intelligence and will become, the more uniform is the thought and life? The nearer we approach to ideal personality, the more we escape from caprice and thoughtlessness. Why then should we refuse to apply the predicate 'personal' to God? The perfect personality might be perfectly regular in the methods of his operation. Mr. Spencer claims, indeed, that he only refuses to attribute personality to the power above us because he believes in something higher — something as far above personality as our intelligence and will are above the modes of being of the plant. But so long as he refuses to recognize what we *can* know, it is vain to console us by assuring us that something exists which we *cannot* know. It must ever remain true that a being without intelligence and will must be less perfect than one who possesses them. We see in our own being, if not in the outward world, effects which demand a personal cause. The very constitution of our minds compels us to attribute to that cause, though in an infinite degree, all the highest qualities of the human spirit; to recognize that the methods of the divine mind and of the human mind are similar, and that man is made in God's image. All this, theism recognizes, but agnosticism denies. Yet Mr. Spencer fancies himself a mediator between science and religion. He proposes terms of reconciliation between these two. They are ancient enemies, he says, but only ignorance of each other keeps them apart. He has discovered the truth which they hold in common. Let each give up that which is purely accidental, and unite upon that which is essential and eternal. What is this common truth? It is simply this: There is a Causal Power which is inscrutable to man. Now this is, to say the least, a very abstract account of religious belief. Mr.

Spencer claims that it is all in which the various religions can be said to agree. This we deny. We maintain, on the other hand, that personality in the cause or causes which control and vivify the universe is an indestructible element in every religion, from fetichism up to Christianity. The sense of mystery and dependence is not religion ; it is only the felt need of religion. Religion is the practical faith in a personal power, or in personal powers, that comes in to supply that felt need. The religion which Mr. Spencer would save is nothing that now goes by that name. It is simply the recognition of a need that is never satisfied. The truly religious man must be a Tantalus. The moment he professes to know anything about the inscrutable power around him and above him, he becomes an example of the impiety of the pious. The moment he tries to satisfy his need of religion, he ceases to be religious. What practical difference is there between saying that there is no God, and saying that there is no God apprehensible by us, no God that we can distinguish from the sum total of things, no God that certainly exists apart from our subjective ideas of Him?

3. We have thus tested Mr. Spencer's philosophical principles by inquiring whether they could explain the origin of life and mind, and whether they led to a proper theory of knowledge. Let us now, with greater brevity, ask with regard to the moral aspects of the system, and its influence upon practical life. Here, as in every scheme of moral philosophy, all the important questions may be reduced to four, and they all centre in the idea of obligation. The first is a question about right : What is the historical origin of the feeling of obligation? The second has to do with law : What is the rational ground of obligation? The third concerns itself with conscience : What is the psychological faculty which determines obligation? And the fourth is conversant with will : What power is there to discharge obligation?

To the first of these questions Mr. Spencer replies that the feeling of obligation is the result of ancestral experiences of utility. Right is adaptation of constitution to conditions. Action unfitted to its surroundings has developed a generic repugnance to similar action in future, and accumulated impressions of this unfitness have become transformed into an instinct so strong and persistent that it is at last independent of conscious experience, and is worthy the name of an intuition. Now we readily grant that an instinctive appetency for certain courses of action, and a blind aversion to certain others, might be plausibly accounted for in this way. We object to the theory that it fails to account for the very thing to be accounted for, namely, the feeling that the latter are reprehensible and the former obligatory. In short, right is confounded with advantage, and wrong with mere unfitness or inutility. All the languages of mankind distinguish between these two ideas and put an immeasurable gulf between them. The awkward countryman at a full-dress reception has a crushing sense of his unfitness to his surroundings, but who would call his feelings those of remorse? I look back with satisfaction to some past right action ; do I mean when I call it right, that it was an action that brought me pleasure or advantage? No, the moral feelings are of a wholly different sort — they affirm not advantage but obligation. The peculiarity of these feelings is that they refer action, not to an external standard of utility, but to an inward standard of right. The words "I ought!" have in them an imperativeness which is wholly

absent when I am calculating what self-interest may be. The old Associationalism accounted for the sentiment of obligation by calling it the result of education or of human enactment. It was well replied: If the sense of right comes from education, whence did the first educator, that is, the first man, derive it? And can it come from law, when law is founded upon obligation and simply expresses it? But Mr. Spencer has discovered a more excellent way. The sense of right is but the transformed feeling of utility or fitness. If this be so, there must have been a first time when utility or fitness was seen to be right; in other words, when useful or fit action was seen to be obligatory. Now, he who knows what snow is, and what white is, may affirm that snow is white. But the man who had no notion of snow, or of white, could never affirm the one of the other. So he who first perceived that the useful was obligatory must have brought this notion of the obligatory with him, instead of getting it from the utility he was scrutinizing. In other words, the idea of right is not inherent in things or actions, but is brought to them by the mind. It does not come from experience, but is an intuition. And Mr. Spencer's attempt to account for the right, by calling it an outgrowth from the useful, labors under the same fatal difficulty which we saw attending his explanation of the other intuitions. In the very first recognition of right on the part of any human being we have necessarily involved a fact of intuition, the judging according to an inward standard that transcends all experience, the evolution of a knowledge that comes from some higher source than mere nature.

So we pass to the second of the questions with regard to the moral aspects of the system. What is its view of law? In what is this recognized obligation grounded? Mr. Spencer's answer is, by implication, already before us. An action is right, not only *as* it is useful, but *because* it is useful. The foundation of moral obligation is in utility, and this utility is to be found in happiness — in the last analysis, the happiness of the individual. It is enough to say that the common judgment of mankind reverses this order, and declares an action to be useful because it is right, and not right because it is useful. To be virtuous for the sake of the happiness that is to come thereby is not to be virtuous at all. Supreme regard for our own interest is not virtue, but is selfishness, the opposite of all virtue. In truth, it is a most serious mistake to regard happiness in any sense, even the happiness of the universe including God himself, as the highest good or as the ground of duty. For this is to say that virtue is not a good in itself, but is good only for the sake of happiness, good only as a means to an end. It is to say that in eternity past, before creation began, God was holy only for the sake of the happiness that holiness would bring — in other words, that holiness has no independent existence in his being, and that he might be unholy if greater happiness would come thereby. This is to merge all his moral attributes in a profound and overmastering self-love, or what is the same thing, to deny them altogether. So the theory that the general well-being is the highest end proves itself to be only a refined form of the utilitarian view — God is righteous only because of what he can make by it. Let those who maintain the good of being in general to be the ground of obligation ask themselves, why they are bound to seek the general good. That question demands an answer. The only answer will be because God has so made

us. We are created in his image, and we reach the end of our being only by conforming to his character. In short, the moral character of God, in whose image we are made, and not the good that will come from right action, is the true ground of moral obligation. How far from this view Mr. Spencer is, we have sufficiently seen. All virtue is reduced to the slippery calculation of our personal interest, and unselfish action for right's sake and for God's sake is not only excluded from the category of morality, but is rendered logically impossible.

We do not need to answer at length our third and fourth questions. We asked what upon this theory was conscience. The only reply is that conscience is simply the mind's power of comparing utilities. No intuitional element enters into it. With no hold upon God's law or God's nature to steady it, it is simply the record of shifting human opinion. There is no immutable morality for it to echo, and conscience has no power to echo it, if there were. What seem to be the impulses of a higher power, commanding obedience to the right, are only misinterpreted instincts to secure our own advantage; what seem to be the threats of a coming judgment upon wrong doing, are but base-born and cowardly fears of ill success. A faculty that cognizes the right as distinct from the agreeable, and that affirms its everlasting obligatoriness, a faculty that adds its sanction to all subordinate judgments as to right which are formed by the intellect, and invests them with its own indefeasible authority — such a faculty as this cannot well be evolved out of mere pleasurable and distasteful sensations. But such a faculty conscience really is, and because it is such a faculty there is no room for it in the system of Mr. Spencer. And it is just so with will, the last subject of our questioning. Free-will — the executive faculty of the soul, the power of discharging obligation — how can this find place in a scheme of blind material development? Nothing can come out at the end but what goes in at the beginning. Without freedom in the Creator, you can have no freedom in the creature. What seems to be freedom, therefore, is but a show. Man's will is necessitated in its action by his external circumstances and conditions. He is not a moral agent. History is a fatalistic development. In short, Ethics is only another name for Physics.

Cicero is reported to have said, with regard to the first of these moral questions, that he who confounded the *honestum* with the *utile*, or the right with mere advantage, deserved to be banished from society. Since his judgment can hardly have been due to theological bigotry, it may well be commended to the consideration of all thorough-going evolutionists. We agree with Cicero in fearing the influence of such a system upon practical life. For, abstract and lofty as speculations like these may seem, like water from the clouds falling upon well-nigh impervious rock, they filter their way after a while to the lowermost strata of society. A system of monism like Mr. Spencer's, with its delusive simplicity, has an inexpressible fascination for those whose intellectual pride cannot brook the perpetual tyranny of pressing but unsolved problems. Especially is such a system attractive to that great multitude of men whose inmost moral feeling is one of dislike to the idea of a God who imposes moral law, and who will execute penalty upon those who are unlike him in moral character. And besides these will be numbers who are carried away unawares by the popular current of opinion,

and who accept this philosophy simply because they know no other. To all these, the breadth of its generalizations, the novelty of its solutions of perplexing questions, and the wealth of scientific knowledge displayed in its illustrations, will make it seem a new gospel of science for mankind.

I believe that this system will be destructive to morality, because history has abundantly shown that life follows doctrine. The denial of God's moral being and governorship takes away the practical authority of conscience. When the solemn voice of duty is hushed, and right is regarded as only an imposing name for utility or pleasure, there is no longer any question whither men's passions and ambitions will lead them. The descent to the pit of rapacity and sensuality is sure, and none the less for the philosophical composure with which the descent began. The philosopher himself may not reach the depths to which his followers are plunged. Early influences of habit and culture, and above all the Christian principles that by a sort of endosmosis have been unconsciously imbibed from the surrounding atmosphere, still keep the thinker outwardly pure and inwardly satisfied. But the very basis of morality is gone from the system, and they whose education is conducted under its influence, and whose principles of living are derived wholly from it, will have no care for truth or love or duty for truth's or love's or duty's sake, and will learn to be false without self-reproach, and to be vicious without fear. Crime is but a name for the ill-repute of crime; make immorality reputable and it ceases at once to be; the new Paul and Virginia, on their island, find that with their advanced ideas of obligation as grounded in the greatest happiness, they can do just what they please. I do not wonder that certain of the representatives of this school are already discussing, with some anxiety, in their Symposia, the question whether belief in a God is not after all necessary to morals. The signs of the times might teach them. Art has begun to feel the poisonous breath of the new philosophy, and the heroic and religious in both painting and sculpture have sensibly withered under it. Pictures for the boudoir have taken the place of pictures for the altar, and a broad immodesty or a piquancy of evil suggestion largely supplants the pure simplicity and lofty purpose of an earlier day. And literature — how vast the change since the transcendental and ideal poetry of Wordsworth gave way to the pagan sensuousness of Algernon Swinburne. All these things are signs of moral decadence under the influence of the general philosophical spirit of our day — a spirit of which Mr. Spencer's system is the most conspicuous and typical example. Let us remember that Epicurus and Lucretius were genial philosophers, but the results of their fatalism in practice are seen in the shamelessness of the Pompeian frescoes, and in the atrocities of the Roman gladiatorial shows under the empire. Thus, with the loss of a God who can be known and obeyed, we lose every true interest of man. To oppose a philosophy which results in so great disaster is therefore the duty of every lover of his kind. It is a congeries of fallacies and of assumptions, but the most vital point at which it may be attacked is its denial of the divine creatorship. There is the first root-falsehood of the scheme; for, without creatorship, God cannot be sovereign over the universe, but must ever fill the subordinate place of a fashioner of intractable material made ready to his hand; indeed, without creatorship, God cannot be personal now that the universe exists, for a God

necessarily bound to a self-existent universe is no longer self-determining or free. The Christian philosopher or theologian who grants the eternity of matter plays unconsciously into the hands of the enemy. The very book-revelation that is so denounced and contemned bears on its forefront the one and only solution to the problem of the universe: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The Sabbath, the weekly memorial of creation, revenges itself on its violators, by proclaiming with all its multitudinous bells the personality of God, manifested not only in the first creation of the universe, but in the new creation of humanity at the resurrection of Christ. And with the Bible and the Sabbath every heart that has been brought into living, loving relation to the heavenly Father, gives in its testimony, not only that God is, and that he can be known, but that this is eternal life that we might know him. To this crowd of witnesses let us join ourselves. For I am persuaded that in this day, when the popular currents of the scientific world are running toward a theory of atheistic evolution which would sweep away the very foundations of knowledge, break down the principles of morality, degrade man to the level of the brute, and hurl almighty wisdom and love and justice from its throne, we can have set before us no nobler task than that of leading the van of a return movement to the old faith in man, the truth, and God.

V.

MODERN IDEALISM.*

The method of thought which I purpose to consider regards ideas as the only objects of knowledge and denies the independent existence of the external world. It is the development of a principle found as far back as Locke. Locke derived all our knowledge from sensation. If any object to this account of Locke's system, and insist that he recognized reflection also as a source of knowledge, we reply that this reflection is with Locke only the mind's putting together of ideas derived from the senses or from its own operations about them.† The mind brings no knowledge with it, has no original power; it is merely the passive recipient and manipulator of ideas received from sensation, finding in its own operations no new material, but only the reflection of what originally came from sense. I do not mean that Locke is always consistent with himself; this he could not be, for, with all his effort to derive knowledge from the senses, there were objects, such as substance and cause, right and God, which persistently refused to be explained in this way. To Locke's statement "There is nothing in the intellect which was not beforehand in the sense," Leibnitz well replied: "Nothing but the intellect itself." But this reply recognized original powers of the mind, and the mind's cognition, upon occasion of sensation, of realities not perceived by sensation or derived from sensation. Locke's denial of such original powers and cognitions opened the way to the exclusive sensationalism of the French Condillac and Baron d'Holbach. So his system led to utilitarianism in morals and to skepticism in religion; for how could the ideas of right or of God be derived from sense? and, if they did not come from sense, what right had they on this theory to exist at all?

Bishop Berkeley, alarmed at what he thought the necessarily materialistic implications of Locke's philosophy, attempted to save the idea of spirit by giving up the idea of matter; or, to speak more accurately, by maintaining that we have no evidence that matter exists except in idea. The sensations which lead us to infer the existence of an outer world are themselves the direct objects of our knowledge — why postulate external matter as causing them? They may be caused directly by God, whose omnipresent intelligence and power are capable of producing uniform and consistent impressions in or upon the minds of his creatures. This thought, existence, or ideal existence, Berkeley would say, is the only existence of the outer world worth contending for. An existence like this being assumed, materialism is vanquished, for the cause of ideas is to be found not in matter but in spirit, not in a self-existent nature but in a living God. No one who has

* Printed in the Bibliotheca Sacra, January, 1888.

† Essay, book ii. chap. xii.

read Berkeley's "Principles of Human Knowledge" can fail to admire the spirit and aim of its author. That his theory can be held side by side with the profoundest belief in special divine revelation is plain, not only from the fact that Berkeley so held it, regarding his view as a bulwark of religious faith, but from the fact that it was also the philosophy of Jonathan Edwards.

Hume, however, regarded Berkeley's application of the principle as only a partial one. Berkeley had said that externally we can be sure only of sensations — cannot, therefore, be sure that a world independent of our sensations exists at all. Hume carried the principle further, and held that internally also we cannot be sure of anything but phenomena. We do not know mental substance within, any more than we know material substance without. John Stuart Mill only follows Hume, when he makes sensations the only objects of knowledge; defines matter as "a permanent possibility of sensation," and mind as "a series of feelings aware of itself." Thomas Huxley follows Hume, when he calls matter "only a name for the unknown cause of states of consciousness." Spencer, Bain and Tyndall are also Humists. All these regard the material atom as a mere centre of force — the hypothetical cause of sensations. In their view, matter is a manifestation of force; while, to the old materialism, force is a property of matter. Unlike these later thinkers, Berkeley held most strenuously to the existence of spirit — for of spirit he thought we had direct knowledge in ourselves. The supposition of an unperceivable material substance was inconsistent with common sense; but the recognition of a personal and self-determining ego was a part of our common sense.* Yet Berkeley in certain passages verges towards Humism, as, for example, where he says: "The very existence of ideas constitutes the soul. Mind is a congeries of perceptions. Take away perceptions, and you take away mind. Put the perceptions, and you put the mind."† All we can say of Hume, therefore, is that he logically and consistently developed a principle which in germ, at least, is found in Berkeley himself. And the agnostic and materialistic idealism of the present day is lineally descended from Locke, through Berkeley. It defines matter and mind alike in terms of sensation, and regards both as opposite sides or manifestations of one underlying and unknowable force. So, as Sydney Smith says, "Bishop Berkeley destroyed the world in one volume octavo, and nothing remained after his time but mind, which experienced a similar fate from the hand of Mr. Hume in 1737."

It is easy to see how mischievous must be the effect of such a system as this. If matter be only a permanent possibility of sensations, then the body through which we experience sensations is itself nothing but a possibility of sensations. If the human spirit be only a series of sensations, then the divine spirit also can be nothing more than a series of sensations. There is no body to have the sensations; and no spirit, either human or divine, to produce them. Kant, in Germany, revolted from these skeptical conclusions, and sought to reclaim philosophy by an examination of the sources of human knowledge. He went back to Locke, and showed that

* Mansel, Letters, Lectures and Reviews, p. 382.

† Works, vol. iv., p. 438 — quoted in Frazer's Berkeley, p. 72.

all sense-perception involves elements not derived from sense, elements rather which are presupposed by sense. "Synthetic conceptions or judgments *a priori*" — space, time, cause, for example — are the conditions of all our intellectual operations. We cannot cognize the outer or the inner world, without finding these conceptions woven into the fabric of our knowledge. So far Kant did good service to science. He vindicated the intuitions, and showed that without them no knowledge is possible. But he erred in not going far enough. He claimed for these intuitions only a subjective existence and validity — they are necessities of our thinking, but they cannot be shown to have objective existence or validity. They are regulative principles merely — whether space, time, cause, substance, God, exist outside of us, mere reason cannot determine. But we reply that when our primitive beliefs are found to be simply regulative they will cease to regulate. The forms of thought are also facts of nature. The mind does not, like the glass of the kaleidoscope,* itself furnish the forms; it recognizes these as having an existence external to itself. Kant failed to see that, in cognizing the qualities of objects, the mind equally cognizes a substance to which the qualities belong; failed to see that the testimony of the reason to the existence of noumena is just as valid as the testimony of sense to the existence of phenomena. Substance is knowable to God and also to man; and, in and with our knowing phenomena, substance is actually and equally known.

Just this failure of Kant led Fichte to reduce all knowledge to the knowledge of self; for, if our own ideas are the sole objects of knowledge, it is only by making the outer world a part of ourselves that we can rescue it from the category of the unknown. Schelling could find no medium between self and the world, or between self and God; hence he assumed a direct intuition of both; it was an intuition, however, which merged the ego in the Absolute, as Fichte had merged the Absolute in the ego; there is identity between them. But if identity, how can the One ever become the many? Here we have the impulse to the system of Hegel, in which subjective idealism becomes complete. Hegel explains the development of the One into the many by saying simply that the laws of thought require this development, and that thought and being are one. So, without giving any explanation of the origin of these laws, life becomes logic, and logic becomes life. The Rational is the Real. All things are but forms of thought, and not only man and the world, but God himself, are made intelligible. If it were not for the fact of sin, and for personal wills that war against the rational and involve themselves in death, the scheme of Hegel would be very attractive. We need only set against it the lines of Wordsworth, which Frazer quotes: †

> "Look up to heaven! the industrious sun
> Already half his race hath run;
> He cannot halt nor go astray,
> But our immortal spirits may."

Thus Hegel revives, and carries to its extremest conclusions, the idealistic principle whose development it was Kant's purpose to check. As Berke-

* Bishop Temple, Bampton Lectures for 1884, p. 13.
† Frazer's Berkeley, p. 205.

ley had declared that *things are only thoughts*, Hegel declared that *thinking thinks*. So there can be thinking without a thinker, thoughts that are not thought. It seems to us that in his system there are two fundamental errors, first, that of assuming a concept without any *mind* to form it; and, secondly, that of assuming that a concept can work itself out into reality without any *will* to execute it. Thoughts take the place of things, both as to cause and effect — all resting on the prior assumption that identity *is* causality, *i. e.*, that the constituent elements of a thought are necessarily the cause of the thing which the thought represents. Yet the system of Hegel has had a strong influence upon later philosophy. Its monistic basis gratifies the speculative intellect. Its easy reduction of the facts of the universe to logical order satisfies the aspiring spirit of man. We may even grant that its omniscient idealism has been a valuable counter-weight to the agnostic materialism of our day. Together with the evolutionary hypothesis of the origin of the world, it has found able advocates in Caird, Green and Seth, in Great Britain, and in Harris, Bowne and Royce in America. Unfortunately it requires of its consistent defenders, though fortunately its defenders are generally not consistent, a rejection of the facts of history and of our moral nature. Sin is a necessity of finiteness and progress. Even Jesus, as he was a man, must be a sinner. The sense of remorse and the belief in freedom are alike illusions. It can hold no view of God which regards him as a veritable moral personality, or as the author of a supernatural revelation. Conscience with its testimony to the voluntariness and the damnableness of sin, as it is the eternal witness against Pantheism, is also the eternal witness against the Idealism of Hegel. We may believe that the utter inability of Hegelianism to explain or even to recognize the ethical problems of the universe is the chief reason for the recent cry, "Back to Kant!" by which the younger thinkers are summoned to return to the feet of a master who at least recognized a moral law and a God who vindicates it.

As it is these younger thinkers whose position is matter of most present interest, I desire to retrace my steps for a moment, and to go back to England and to those who came after Hume. As Kant in Germany thought to set up a barrier to Hume's skepticism by pointing out the *a priori* elements in all knowledge, so Reid in England maintained against Hume the principles of the Philosophy of Common Sense. Reid, though with some inaccuracies of statement, held to the doctrine of Natural Realism, reducing perception to an act of immediate and intuitive cognition. The notion of representative ideas as the object of perception was excluded. The mind comes directly in contact with external things. How it knows them we do not know, but we know as little how it can perceive itself. The knowledge of the external world is not made explicable, it is rather made inexplicable, by assuming that the direct object of perception is a representative idea, which we have no means of comparing with the object which it represents. Reid did not distinguish between original and acquired perceptions, and he sometimes made sensation the occasion of suggesting, rather than the condition of perceiving, extended externality; yet his services to Natural Realism were great, and philosophy will never cease to be his debtor.

Sir William Hamilton sought to remedy the defects of Reid, and to re-

duce the doctrine of common sense to a consistent system. He showed the absurdity of the scheme of representative perception, which declares the external world to be real, while yet it makes ideas to be the only objects of which we are conscious. Either we must "abolish any immediate, ideal, subjective object, representing; — or we must abolish any mediate, real, objective object, represented." * And yet even Hamilton was not self-consistent. Our knowledge of an external object is made up, he says of three factors, of which, if the total be represented by the number twelve, the object may be said to furnish six, the body three, and the mind three. Here an ideal element is admitted which may so vitiate the result as to render it impossible to say that we correctly apprehend the object at all. The secondary qualities of matter, such as color, sound and smell, he grants to be "not objects of perception at all, being only the unknown causes of subjective affections in the percipient, and therefore incapable of being immediately perceived." † Even the primary qualities of matter in external objects we do not apprehend directly, but only through "the consciousness that our locomotive energy is resisted, and not resisted by aught in the organism itself. For in the consciousness of being thus resisted is involved, as a correlative, the consciousness of a resisting something." Porter also remarks that Hamilton does not explain how, in the necessity of finding for this effect an extra-organic cause, this "correlative," "resisting something" must be shown to be also *extended*. "The agent, the *ego*, as percipient and actor, is not extended; why may not the extra-organic agent and *non-ego* be non-extended, or why must it be extended?" ‡

If we add now to this statement of Hamilton's doctrine the fact that in his view "sensation proper has no object but a subject-object," in other words, an affection of the animated organism, we shall see that his Natural Realism limits itself to a knowledge of primary qualities in our own organism. If we go further and consider his concessions to Idealism, we shall be able to narrow down the controversy still more. In that remarkable table of systematic schemes of external perception which he has appended to his edition of the Works of Reid, § he has defined Idealists as those who view the object of consciousness in perception as ideal, that is, as a phenomenon in or of mind. As denying that this ideal object has any external prototype, they may be styled Absolute Idealists. The chief merit of Hamilton's classification, however, is to be found in his subdivision of Absolute Idealists into two subordinate classes, according as the Idea is, or is not, considered a modification of the percipient mind. We have then the two schemes of Egoistical and Non-egoistical Idealism. The former is, in general, the scheme of the German thinkers; the latter the scheme of the English thinkers, notably of Berkeley. Of the former we have already said all that is needful; with regard to the latter we wish to point out a fact that is not so generally understood, namely, that this form of Idealism regards the Idea not as a mode of the human mind. While it is not a *mode* of the mind, it may yet be *in* the mind — infused into it by God; or it may *not*

* Dissertations on Reid, note C, pp. 816, 817.
† Porter, Human Intellect, p. 237.
‡ Porter, Human Intellect, pp. 184, 185.
§ Note C, p. 817.

be in the perceiving mind itself, but in the divine Intelligence, to which the perceiving mind is intimately present, and in which the perceiving mind views it. Lotze, of all the Germans, seems to hold to this latter form of Idealism. The world to him is a series of phenomena, without value in itself, and having value only as its *meaning* is valuable; and the mind of man is "like a spectator who comprehends the æsthetic significance of that which takes place on the stage of a theatre, and would gain nothing essential if he were to see, besides, the machinery by means of which the changes are effected on the stage." *

Bishop Berkeley in his earlier writings seemed to regard all knowledge as conversant with the affections of the percipient mind. He hardly distinguished between the idea as an object and the idea as an act. The first statements seem, therefore, to be statements of subjective idealism. "Sense-percepts differ from the ideas of the imagination only in degree, not in kind; and both belong to the individual mind." † But in later years Berkeley saw what some of his followers have not seen, namely, that things are not mere possible sensations — these would afford no explanation of the permanent existence of real objects. He came, therefore, to regard external things as caused in a regular order by the divine will, and independently of our individual experience. When we look at external things, we look at ideal existences in the divine mind — archetypes — of which sense-experience may be said to be the recognition and realization in our intelligence. So Berkeley's later statements are statements of objective, as distinguished from subjective, idealism. The world without has the best guarantee for its reality and permanence in that it is the constant expression of an omnipresent and eternal Mind. The non-ego, in fact, *is* God, manifesting his intelligence and his will. As we live, move and have our being in God physically, so we live, move and have our being in God mentally. Even self-consciousness has its basis in God's ideas of us; and memory is only the reading of our past, in God's record-book. The existence of the inner as well as the outer world in God, while it is an ideal existence, is yet the most secure and permanent that can possibly be conceived.

Here then we have an objective Idealism which is free from some of the objections to which the common German Idealism is exposed. It is interesting to note how gently Sir William Hamilton treated it. In a foot-note to the last-mentioned of his Dissertations he says: —

"The general approximation of thorough-going Realism and thorough-going Idealism here given may, at first sight, be startling. On reflection, however, their radical affinity will prove well-grounded. Both build upon the same fundamental fact — that the extended object immediately perceived is identical with the extended object actually existing; — for the truth of this fact, both can appeal to the common sense of mankind; and to the common sense of mankind Berkeley did appeal, not less confidently, and perhaps more logically, than Reid. Natural Realism and Absolute Idealism are the only systems worthy of a philosopher; for, as they alone have any foundation in consciousness, so they alone have any consistency in themselves."

* Lotze, Outlines of Metaphysics (Ladd), p. 152.

† Adamson on Berkeley, in Encyclopædia Britannica.

And in his reply to the Berkeleian, T. Collyns Simon, Hamilton expressly says :* —

"If Berkeley held that the Deity caused one permanent material universe (be it supposed apart or not apart from his own essence), which universe, on coming into relation with our minds through the medium of our bodily organism, is in certain of its correlative sides or phases, so to speak, external to our organism, objectively or really perceived (the primary qualities), or determines in us certain subjective affections of which we are conscious (the secondary qualities); in that case I must acknowledge Berkeley's theory to be virtually one of natural realism, the differences being only verbal. But again, if Berkeley held that the Deity caused no permanent material universe to exist and to act uniformly as one, but does himself either infuse into our several minds the phenomena (ideas) perceived and affective, or determines our several minds to elicit within consciousness such apprehended qualities or felt affections, in that case I can recognize in Berkeley's theory only a scheme of theistic idealism, — in fact, only a scheme of perpetual and universal miracle, against which the law of parcimony is conclusive, if the divine interposition be not proved necessary to render possible the facts."

Hamilton here seems to grant that Absolute Idealism, if it be non-egoistical, and if it regard the ideal object as not in the mind itself, is virtually the same with Natural Realism. Whether this was the philosophy of Berkeley may be matter of question; but it is at any rate along this line that our younger thinkers in philosophy are working. A world of ideas, indistinguishable by us from external realities, constituting in fact the *only* external realities, is open to our minds by virtue of our living, moving, and having our being, in God. In our investigations of nature as well as in our examination of our own consciousness, we are only, as Kepler said, "thinking of God's thoughts after him," or rather perceiving the ideal realities of God's being. Such a conception is not necessarily merely logical, like Hegel's: God may be heart, as well as mind; may be conscience and will, as well as intellect. But creation, on this view, is an ideal process; the world, before finite intelligences existed, had only an ideal existence in God's mind, even as it now exists only in the minds of God and of his creatures.

There is a reason for this increasing prevalence of Idealism. Science has resolved the sensible universe into various modes of motion. Smell, sound, color, equally with pleasure and pain, are subjective sensations. The causes of them are not like in nature to the effects — they are only vibrations of some external medium,—

> "What sees is Mind, what hears is Mind;
> The ear and eye are deaf and blind."

What is true of the so-called secondary qualities of matter is equally true of the primary. Even extension and impenetrability can be conceived of only in relation to some sentient being which experiences resistance to its locomotive energy or which resists some locomotive energy from without. In fine, "matter can be defined only in terms of sensation; yet without

* Veitch, Memoir of Sir William Hamilton, p. 346.

mind sensation is impossible." Hence the idealist concludes that all that we know of matter is ideal. Certain sensations in ourselves comprise the whole of our knowledge. The causes of these sensations are unknown. Vibrations, motions, molecules, atoms, aye, even force itself, are but names for the unknown causes of our subjective states. Here is the refutation of materialism; for matter can have no meaning except in connection with percipient mind. Materialism can never explain the nature of atoms; they can be conceived of neither as indivisible nor as infinitely divisible. Even the materialistic conception of law involves the idea of mind as ordering the arrangements of the universe. The cause of our sensations does not need to be material — it may be spiritual instead. What we call the world outside of us may be the constant product of a divine activity working upon our own minds; better still, it may be a constant ideal divine presentation *to* our minds.

There are many considerations once urged against Idealism which we must pronounce invalid against this new form of idealistic doctrine. It has been said that ideas, as *given*, presuppose an objective reality as cause. The new idealism accepts the dictum, but declares the world of ideas, as neither in the mind nor a modification of the mind, to be just such an objective reality. In other words, objective idealism declines any longer to be treated as subjective idealism; it regards ideas as something distinct from the cognition of them; it may even hold that these ideas are themselves extended, and that they have all the qualities which we now attribute to the material and external object. May not God suggest ideas *to* me, which are not *in* me nor *of* me? Do we not, by words, suggest such ideas to one another? It may seem strange to hear of ideas which are not of the mind; but the idealist would regard such ideas as actually constituting the objective reality which we perceive. Of such a sort he would regard even the extended matter which we see. It is an ideal object, existing only for intelligence, and as inseparable from intelligence as the pleasure or pain we feel in viewing it. The apple, for example, exists for mind and only for mind; yet it has an objective existence to the mind, and is not a mere mode of the mind. The best illustration of the theory, however, is derived from the mind's relation to abstract truth. This truth exists by virtue of the minds that perceive it; yet it is neither in nor of the human mind alone. While it is objective to man, it is subjective to God. So, it may be argued, does the universe exist. God's ideas constitute its reality, its permanence, its stability. It is as little the product of the finite individual mind, as is the law of gravitation, or the existence of space, or the truth that right is obligatory. And yet it exists only in intelligence, and for intelligence; for, whether man is or is not, all things subsist eternally in God.

Here is the theory which claims, equally with natural realism, that objects are perceived directly. The objection has frequently been made to the theory of representative perception, that either in spite of the idea objects remain unknown, or by means of it they become known, in which case there must be a comparison of ideas with their objects — a comparison which can have no meaning or value except upon the hypothesis that the objects are known already. But the theory we are considering is a theory of presentative, and not of representative, idealism. In this theory the ideas are them-

selves the objects, and the only objects ; as such they are perceived directly, and there can be no talk about comparing them with any reality beyond. Over against this simplest form of Idealism we desire to put the simplest form of Natural Realism, in order that we may compare the merits of the two. This simplest form of Natural Realism holds only that we know something in space and time, something distinguishable from God as well as from ourselves, something which has permanent power to produce sensations in us, something which continues to exist whether we perceive it or not. In short, Natural Realism holds to the existence of a somewhat intermediate between God and the soul, even though this somewhat be nothing more than force. God and the soul are not the only entities. The world exists not only ideally but also substantially, and this substantial world exists in the form of extended externality.

The first consideration which suggests itself in comparing these two opposing views is that Objective Idealism rests upon the exceedingly precarious assumption that the mind is capable of knowing only *ideas*, while Natural Realism has in its favor the universal belief of mankind that we know *things* as well. Certainly the presumption is that the universal belief of mankind is a correct one ; and this belief is not to be surrendered until it be shown self-contradictory. To say that things *are* ideas, is to common sense a yet greater absurdity. Men in general make a perfectly clear distinction between thoughts and external objects, and they cannot be persuaded to confound the one with the other. They may be persuaded to accept a thousand vagaries with regard to the ultimate constitution of matter ; they may believe in ultimate atoms and vortex-rings ; even the fourth dimension of space may come to seem credible to them ; but to dissolve the external world into a dream, even though that dream be a permanent one and the very image of reality, is beyond the utmost stretch of their credulity.

Idealism is inconsistent with itself. It is compelled to admit that in knowing ideas the mind knows self. We cannot know ideas except by projecting them as it were from the mind. * Thus we cannot know the non-ego, even in the shape of ideas, without also knowing the ego that has the ideas. Self-consciousness then is a witness to the existence of a permanent somewhat underneath all ideas, and which all ideas presuppose. But this permanent somewhat which manifests itself in mental phenomena and is the subject of them, which in fact is known in and by the same concrete act in which we know our ideas, cannot possibly be conceived in any other way than as an indivisible, identical entity. It cannot itself be an idea, or a combination of ideas, for the very first idea presupposes it. It cannot be a mere succession of feelings, for the mind never knows itself as a succession of feelings — if it could do so, it would know itself as that which was not I. It cannot be simply a relation, for relation is inconceivable unless there are things or ideas to be related, and these things or ideas must go before the relation, whereas self is known not as the product of ideas but as producing ideas. So idealism is forced to grant the existence of something before ideas, and more than ideas, namely, the self. But this permanent some-

* J. Clark Murray, Hand-book of Psychology, p. 279.

what which we call self is just such an entity as we designate by substance; and the concession of the existence of mental substance logically carries with it the concession that material substance may exist also.

Idealism of the objective sort tries in vain to maintain the purely ideal character of the external world, and at the same time to declare that the object perceived is different from the act of perception. But if the object perceived be different from the act of perception — in other words, if objective idealism be not resolved into subjective idealism, if non-egotistic idealism be not resolved into egotistic idealism — then the existence of the object cannot be dependent upon the percipient act, its *esse* cannot be *percipi*. Its intellectual existence, if we may so speak, is contingent upon the existence of a perceiving intellect. But this is only to say that it cannot be known without knowledge, cannot be apprehended without mind, cannot fulfil its purpose without being perceived, either by God or man. The error of the theory is in confounding intellectual existence, or the existence of the object as known, with its real existence. As Professor Knight has said: "That the object perceived has a relation of intellectual dependence on the percipient subject is obvious, so far as his cognition extends; but if the object perceived be different from the act of perception, it cannot be in any sense dependent on it, or on a similar act, for its existence." And so we agree with Veitch, when he says that Hamilton granted too much to Berkeley, in saying that a non-egotistical idealism is hardly distinguishable from natural realism.*

Idealism gives no proper account of the distinction between the non-ego in the shape of ideas and the non-ego in the shape of our bodily organism; in other words, it ignores the difference between body and the idea of body. Nothing can be plainer to the common mind than that it knows something outside of itself and different from itself, something extended, something in space, something which causes ideas but which is not itself ideas. The mind not only distinguishes itself from the body it inhabits, but it distinguishes its ideas of body from the body of which it forms ideas. It ascribes to the body externality and extension. These properties cannot be conceived as belonging to ideas. The idea of body and the actual body are no less distinct than are the idea of a house and the actual house. Body is apprehended as something permanent and independent of our perception of it; but, more than this, it is apprehended as existing over against the percipient mind, as capable of measurement by the mind, as having spatial relations in a way that the mind has not. This belief in the existence of a real in distinction from a merely ideal body, a body that is extended and external to the mind, is the most primary and important fact of sense-perception. Idealism, by failing to explain this belief, fails at the most critical point of all. It attempts to confound outness with distance, whereas distance is only a peculiar degree of outness, and itself presupposes outness. And, as Veitch has well shown, the externality of the object of sense is no more unintelligible than is the externality of one mind to another mind, or to God.† Here we are persuaded that Natural Realism has a stronghold from which no speculative Idealism can ever dislodge it. Reduce the

* Veitch's Hamilton, p. 178.

† Veitch's Hamilton, pp. 186-188.

problem to its simplest terms if you will — put on the one side an objective idealism of divine ideas independent of our causation and perceived as something permanent and separate from our perceiving minds — put on the other side a natural realism, holding that we perceive an actually extended object in space, at least in our own organism, whose existence, as real, we distinguish from any possible ideal existence — and we must decide that the latter represents the facts of our experience, while the former contradicts them.

Idealism finds in self the ground of unity for mental phenomena. It should find in material substance the ground of unity for material phenomena. Not that this knowledge of mental or material substance, as the case may be, is reached in either case by any process of inference or argument. It is the inevitable and universal judgment of the reason, in connection with self-consciousness, on the one hand, and of sense-perception on the other. When we recognize thoughts, we recognize the self as thinking; when we perceive qualities of matter, we perceive that they belong to something which they qualify. The qualities and the substance qualified are known in the same concrete act; though we ascribe to sense the cognition of quality, to reason the cognition of substance. Without this cognition of substance the impressions of sense could have no unity and could give us no knowledge of things. Sensation brings us in contact only with points. These points would be heterogeneous and disconnected if they were not recognized by some power as related to each other. Our knowledge of an object is not a knowledge of these points, but rather of a whole which these points manifest; these points can be related to each other, and fused into a whole, only by the recognition of a somewhat to which they belong and of which they are phenomena. The soul's judgment that there is a material substance, in which material qualities inhere and which gives these qualities their ground of unity, is just as inevitable an act of reason as that other judgment which accompanies the thoughts within and finds for them a ground of unity in the cognition of a mental substance which we call the conscious self.

Idealism confounds the conditions of external knowledge with the objects of knowledge. What is the object of knowledge in sense-perception? This theory replies: "The object of sense-perception is sensations or ideas;" and it propounds the dilemma: "Either the object is unknown and the mind knows only ideas, or ideas are known and there is no need of assuming the existence of any other object whatever." But the same rule should work equally well, or ill, when applied to the world within. We should then be compelled to say: "Either the ego is unknown and the mind knows only ideas, or the ideas are known and there is no need of assuming the existence of any ego at all." The majority of idealists will not say this. Berkeley would have denied it, for he strenuously held to the existence of spirit and to our consciousness of its existence. But it was by an inconsistency in his logic that he so held, and Hume remorselessly exposed this inconsistency. In self-consciousness we have the key to the problem. Mysterious as it might speculatively seem that mind should know self in knowing its own thoughts, it is still a fact that mind does thus know self; and to say that the thoughts are the only objects of knowledge

is to confound objects of knowledge with conditions of knowledge. So, in the external world, we cannot know matter except through sensations and ideas; but to make sensations and ideas the only objects of knowledge is here also to confound objects of knowledge with conditions of knowledge. In sense-perception, my ideas and sensations are mere conditions of knowledge. In and through them I cognize that which is beyond, that which produces in me the ideas and sensations, namely, external objects, at least in my own organism — objects which by analysis I see to include both substance and quality. I see the moon in like manner through the telescope; the telescope is the means or condition of my seeing the moon. I may, it is true, turn my attention exclusively to the telescope and make that the object of my thought; yet he would talk very absurdly who should say that *either* the moon is unknown and I know only the telescope, *or* the telescope is known and there is no need of assuming the existence of any moon beyond it. The truth is that I cognize the moon through the telescope; if I choose I can think of both telescope and moon together; but the absurdest of all things is to say that, in looking through the telescope, I see the telescope only and not the moon. So Idealism confounds the conditions of knowledge with the objects of knowledge. That through ideas and sensations we have knowledge of things, is one of the most indubitable facts of consciousness.

The Idealist cannot be consistent without denying the existence of any other intelligent being besides himself. He claims that the mind can know only ideas. What we call the external world is only a succession or combination of ideas, and hence no *material* substance can be known. But what we call our fellow-beings — are not they also only successions or combinations of ideas in which by the same rule no *mental* substance can be known? Self-consciousness compels the Idealist to recognize a self which is the permanent basis and habitat of his own ideas; but why should he recognize the existence of other people? If material things are nothing but ideas, then our fellow-men are nothing but ideas. If my neighbor's body exists only in idea, then his soul must also exist only in idea. The mere fact that the highway robber, when he attacks me, seems to be a conscious personality, must not blind me to the fact that he, like the club which he carries, is but a series or combination of ideas. I shall be a very inconsistent Idealist if I regard that series of ideas as responsible or guilty; for responsibility and guilt imply something more than a series or combination of ideas — they imply a subject, a mind, a permanent self, endowed with conscience and free will. In short, we must become solipsists, believers only in our own existence. But we cannot stop even here. The solipsist cannot long believe even in the existence of himself, if by "himself" he means a permanent, identical, substantial soul. And as a matter of fact the new Psychology in Germany — the psychology of Wundt and Fechner, describes itself as "psychology without a soul."

The new Idealism seeks to avoid the solipsistic conclusion by taking refuge in the consciousness of God, and by making that the guarantee for the objective existence of our fellow-men. It is a vain resource. The same rule which deprives us of all guarantee for the existence of our fellow-men deprives us also of all guarantee for the existence of God. If we know only

ideas in the case of our fellow-men, we can know only ideas in the case of God. And if God is only a series or combination of ideas, what possible meaning is there in the phrase "consciousness of God," the utterance of which seems such a relief to the Idealist? A consciousness, with no being to *be* conscious; consciousness without a self; universal thinking without a thinker — ah, it is our old Hegelian acquaintance: "thinking thinks!" Notice how completely this philosophy merges the affectional and the volitional elements of the divine Being in the merely intellectual, and then transmutes even that into the vague phrase "universal consciousness." It is the God without personality or moral character, without love or will, which the purely speculative intellect ever seeks to substitute for the living God, the God of holiness who denounces and punishes sin, the God of love who redeems from sin by his own atoning sacrifice. Did I say that this theory gave us a non-moral God — a stone in place of bread? It does not even give us this — a consistent idealism can give us no God at all, it can give us only the *idea* of him. If we know only ideas, we can have no more guarantee that God or man objectively exists than we can have for the objective existence of matter.

Idealism is monistic in its whole conception of the universe. It claims to be a "one-substance" theory, although it should in consistency call itself a "no-substance" theory instead. It repudiates the doctrine of two substances, matter and mind, because it cannot understand how mind should ever in that case be able to know matter. Materialism declares that mind knows matter because mind is matter; idealism declares that mind knows matter because matter is mind. The one is just as much an arbitrary assumption as is the other. Both are *argumenta ad ignorantiam.* Because we cannot explain *how* we know that which is other than ourselves, shall we deny that we *do* know things and beings other than ourselves? It is not essential to knowledge that there be identity or even similarity of nature between the knower and the known. God can know what sin is — aye, *only* God can fully know the nature of evil. It is just as much a problem how we can know ourselves, as it is how we can know the external world. "The primitive dualism of consciousness" is just as inexplicable as the primitive dualism of substance. "The mental act in which self is known implies, like every other mental act, a perceiving subject and a perceived object. If then the object perceived is self, what is the subject that perceives? or, if it is the true self which thinks, what other self can it be that is thought of?" But this very consciousness of personality, this very cognition of self of which Herbert Spencer speaks, in the words I have quoted, he declares in the next sentence to be "a fact beyond all others the most certain,"* and in spite of his subsequent attempts to explain it away, we may take his testimony as to the universal fact of its existence. But if man knows a non-ego in his own thoughts, he may know a non-ego in other beings or in the world outside of him; and our inability to explain the mode of this knowledge should not for a moment shake our confidence in the fact.

Idealism is compelled to recognize an action of the *will* upon matter,—

* First Principles, p. 65.

why should it not with equal readiness recognize an action of the *intellect* upon matter? If I can *move* something outside myself, why can I not *know* something outside myself? It seems absurd to suppose that I *produce effects* only upon an ideal world when I exert my powers of volition, — why is it not equally absurd to suppose that I *know* only an ideal world when I exert my powers of sense-perception? I come in contact with real things and real beings when I use my will, — what right have I to say that I come in contact only with ideas when I use my mind? And, when we rise to the consideration of God's relation to the world, what right have we to say that God's power exhausts itself in mere thinking, or that God is capable of no creation but the creation of ideas? Man can make a thing whose existence continues after his own act upon it has ceased,— cannot God do the same? Man can give his thoughts objective shapes — Phidias and Praxiteles put their ideas into form and make them live forever,— cannot God give substantive expression to his thoughts also? Must God be shut up to an eternal process of thinking, without the power to create substances other than himself which shall in their various degrees reflect his wisdom and his love? Berkeley believes that God is himself a Spirit, and that he creates finite spirits of a different substance from himself. Why cannot he who has thus in finite spirits disjoined from himself a certain portion of spiritual force and given to it a relative independency,— why cannot he also and just as easily in material substance disjoin from himself a certain portion of physical force and give to it a relative independency?

I have thus far treated Modern Idealism from a philosophical point of view, and I have endeavored to show that even from this point of view it possesses no advantages over the doctrine of Natural Realism. But we are bound to look further, and to judge the new system by its probable influence upon Christian faith. Is it consistent with the things "which have been fully established among us"— the accepted teachings of Scripture? I do not now ask whether noted Christian thinkers here and there have or have not held to the idealistic scheme. Here I have to do, not with the actual results, but with the logical tendencies of the system, while at the same time it may be well remembered that in the long run these logical tendencies make themselves practically felt. The first of these tendencies which I notice in the new philosophy is the tendency to merge all things in God. Dr. Krauth * very properly calls it the weakness of idealism that it finds unity not in the harmony of the things that differ, but in the absorption of the one into the other. Instead of tracing all things to one source, it prefers the shorter and easier method of asserting that all things are but forms of one substance. The conception of a God who *is* all, seems to it preferable to that of a God who *creates* all. In this, the doctrine runs directly counter to the Scripture teaching that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," and so removes the barrier which God himself has set up against a pantheistic confounding of himself with his works. But further than this, idealism destroys all distinction between the possible and the actual. A possible universe, as already in God's thoughts, is already an actual universe; and, *vice versa*, an actual universe, as only in

* Berkeley's Principles of Knowledge, Krauth's Prolegomena, p. 130.

God's thoughts, is nothing more than a possible universe. The whole geologic and astronomic history of the universe before man came upon the planet was only a thought-history,—events, aside from God's thought of them, there were none. Such as they were, they always were; and the universe is as eternal in the past as is God's thought of it, for God's thought *is* the universe. And since the future universe exists only in God's thought it is existent now as much as it will ever be. Preservation is only continuous creation; continuous creation is nothing but God's thinking; and God's thinking is from eternity to eternity. Second causes do not exist; for, as things are but the ideas of God, all changes in these things are but the direct effects of a divine efficiency. All causal connections between different objects of the universe are at an end. No such things as physical forces exist. Nature becomes a mere phantom, and God is the only cause of all physical events. Science becomes at once, not the study of nature, but the study of God.

I have said that Idealism destroys all distinction between the possible and the actual; I must go further, and say that it destroys all distinction between truth and error. It holds that ideas alone are the objects of knowledge; the world without and the world within are alike ideas; these ideas constitute the world; and the existence of these ideas is due directly to the causative intelligence of God. But if ideas *are* the reality, how can man have false ideas? Is it not beyond dispute that we have ideas which do not correspond to the objective truth? Are *these* realities also? and is God the author of them? Men have selfish, sensual, murderous thoughts; they hate and malign God; they slander and destroy his creatures. Are these lying ideas and representations eternal truths and realities also? Have we not here the proof that the divine ideas must differ from sense-ideas in us, and that our ideas are not the realities but only individual interpretations of reality, born of our wilfulness and moral perversion? Berkeley seems at times aware that there is a difficulty in identifying our ideas with the divine archetypes; but the fear of recognizing in these divine archetypes a new sort of "things in themselves" seems to have prevented him from making further explanations. Is it not plain that no explanation is possible that identifies the idea with the object? Does not this abolish the distinction between truth and error, and make both our right and our wrong the direct product of the divine will?

Why should not Idealism go further, and declare that God is the only cause in the realm of spirit as well as in the realm of matter? If Idealism be not logically self-contradictory, it must do this. If my body, so far as it is objective to me, may be a mere idea of God, then my soul, so far as it is objective to me, may be a mere idea of God also. All my ideas are ideas of God, and God causes them. What becomes of my personal identity? What is to prevent Jonathan Edwards, as he does, from basing identity upon the arbitrary decree of God, and from declaring that God, merely by so decreeing, makes Adam's posterity one with their first father and responsible for his sin? What is to prevent the necessitarian from declaring that, since all motives are ideas, and all ideas are due to direct divine causation, the soul has no permanent existence of its own and no freedom that can furnish the slightest basis for responsibility? What we call the moral law

is nothing but the presentation of a sublime divine idea; and what we call sin is nothing but the presentation of another divine idea which is given us simply to contrast with, and to emphasize, the first. Both evil and good are purely ideal. Not our wills but our thoughts are to be purged, and that by imparting to us both the good thoughts and the evil thoughts that are in the mind of God. The freedom to choose the good and to refuse the evil — this does not exist; for this would imply the existence of a substance separate from that of God. God is equally the source of evil and of good, — the morally pure and the morally impure are both alike to him. What we have usually regarded as the greatest of blasphemies is only simple fact, for God is not only the author, but the sole author, of sin; he is not only the sum and source of all good, he is also the sum and source of all evil.

All this is to deny the testimony of conscience, and to strike at the roots of all morality. It is easy to see how the whole Christian doctrine of redemption goes by the board, when once sin is regarded as a natural necessity, and ideas are held to be the only real objects of knowledge. It is no longer necessary to believe in an external revelation of God's will. Internal revelation, Christian consciousness, the direct presentation to our minds of new ideas from God, takes the place of outward Scripture, or assumes coördinate importance and authority with it. It is no longer necessary to make a clear distinction between ideal characterization and real history. Jesus Christ, with his resurrection from the dead, his atoning death and ascension to the Father, can now be conceived of after an ideal fashion. These things never were, as they are pictured to be; but that makes little difference,— the object is attained — namely, the fostering of an idea in our minds. Historical testimony becomes of little account when it contradicts a preconceived theory; the idea is better than the fact — for the fact itself is only an idea. And if it be suggested that to the man who thus turns God's facts into mere ideas, by denying the record that God gives of his Son, there will come the sure and certain punishment of his unbelief, the reply is easy, that since punishment can come only in idea, and ideas, so far as we know, end with this life, there is little to fear, for since this life is but a dream, immortality is something still less substantial — even the dream of that dream. With the evidence of personal identity the evidence of personal immortality is lost also.

So the Idealism of the present day tends to Solipsism which is mere self-deification on the one hand, or to Pantheism which is the abolition of all moral distinctions on the other. It is the natural recoil from Materialism, and yet it contains in itself germs of as great evil as did that foe with which the last generation so stoutly fought. It is the drift of our current philosophy, and the antagonist with which Christianity has to cope, and which Christianity will surely conquer, in the few decades to come. Sir William Hamilton opposed Idealism simply because he believed that it contradicted our consciousness and so destroyed the foundation of all knowledge and of all faith. And yet I know of no process of mere argument which to an idealistic sceptic will demonstrate that material substance exists. I can tell him that in his very perception of quality he intuitively cognizes substance; but he may deny it. I can tell him that his ideas of the external world require a cause; but he may refer me to God as their cause. I may say,

with Aristotle, that "things are not born of concepts;" but he may reply that to him this is the most intelligible explanation of the universe. When I come to the results of his doctrines in ethics, I may have greater hope of convincing him; but even here I can make little progress, if he has blunted his conscience and schooled himself into a belief in determinism. Practically I know of no better remedy for his disease than the acceptance of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is remarkable how the submission of the will to him as a divine Teacher, Savior, and Lord, results in a renewal and recreation of the will,— how the man who previously regarded himself as a victim of necessity, a mere waif swept upon the current, when once he has received the Savior into his heart, finds that he is now a free man, and becomes conscious of his substantial manhood. For the first time he knows that he has a soul. And as at the Reformation those who had become sceptical of the existence of objective truth and righteousness, aye, even of the existence of God himself, when they once found by believing in Christ that they had God sure, proceeded to the discovery and recognition of objective realities outside of them and opened the way to the progress of modern science; so now, in the individual heart, again and again, the reception of Christ, giving the first sense of reality within, leads the soul outward to the recognition of a real world and of a real morality outside of it. So Christ is the way and the truth and the life, and he whom the Son makes free becomes free indeed. *

* Gunsaulus, Transfiguration of Christ, pp. 18, 19.

VI.

SCIENTIFIC THEISM.*

It is my aim in this paper to discuss the possibility of a scientific theism, or in other words, the nature of our belief in the existence of God, the sufficiency of the grounds upon which it rests, and the adequacy of this belief for the purposes of science.

Mr. Huxley, if I mistake not, has discoursed pleasantly upon the absurdity of devoting any great share of our attention to lunar politics. But against selenology, or the science of lunar physics, he would probably urge no serious objections. The possibility of such a science he would admit to depend upon three things, first, the actual existence of such a body as the moon; secondly, the fact that the human mind has powers which fit it for knowing the moon; and thirdly, the provision of means by which the moon is brought into contact with the mind. The eye, or the telescope, or both, may bridge the gulf, and give us actual knowledge where there was only the possibility of knowledge before. A synthesis of the facts thus discovered, and the exhibition of them in their relations as parts of a system, might justly be called selenology.

I use this illustration, not by any means to indicate the nature of our knowledge of God, but only to point out the natural conditions of it. As in the case just mentioned, a scientific theism is possible only upon condition, first, that such a Being as God exists; secondly, that the human mind has capacities for knowing God; and thirdly, that God has been brought into intelligible contact with the human mind by revelation. If this revelation be an external one and assure us of facts which exist independently of our consciousness of them, we have in them the proper material for science; and theology, in this department of it, does nothing more than put these facts in their appointed places, as the builders of Solomon's temple took the stones made ready to their hand and put them, without the sound of saw or hammer, into the places for which they had been designed by the architect.

It is to the first of these conditions of a scientific theism, and to the first only, that I wish at present to direct attention. Does God exist? We find ourselves compelled at the very outset to define the term we use. What do we mean by God? By that name we designate not the abstract Absolute or Infinite of the metaphysicians, nor the necessarily developing life-principle of nature, to which the Pantheist holds, but rather the absolutely perfect Being — a Being whose very perfection involves a power of self-limitation — a Being who is absolute, not in the sense that he exists in *no* relation, but that he exists in no *necessary* relation; a Being who is infinite, not in the

* An essay read before "The Club," Rochester, February 16, 1875.

sense of excluding all coëxistence of the finite, but as constituting the ground and condition of the finite, so that nothing exists beside himself except by his sufferance or under his control. God is not all things, finite as well as infinite, material as well as spiritual, foolish as well as wise, unholy as well as pure. In one sense he is the most limited being in the universe, since he can never be otherwise than he is. But whatever limitations there are to his nature are imposed from within, never from without. That he cannot lie, or cease to be, is a part of his infinite perfection.

God is the absolutely perfect Being,— but more than this must go to our definition, before it answers to our conception or becomes of practical use in our inquiry. By God, we mean not only a being who *may* exist in relation to the universe and to us, but a being who *does* exist in such relation. This Being, whose perfection answers to and transcends our highest conceptions, and to whom we are notwithstanding so closely related, we recognize in three aspects : first, as a power above us upon which we are dependent; secondly, as an authority which imposes law upon our moral natures; and thirdly, as a personality which we may recognize in prayer and worship. As we reflect upon the matter, we perceive that the spiritual energy of such a Being must be inexhaustible ; trying to find its bounds, we become speedily convinced that it reaches on and on forever ; immature thought may set limits here and there, or conceive of other like powers and personalities ; but more thorough investigation into the contents of our own conception assures us that this Being, whom we name God, is both infinite and one.

The belief that such a Being as this exists, a Being upon whom we are dependent, to whom we are morally bound, whom we may address in prayer — a Being who, as Author, Lawgiver, End, answers to our highest notions of perfection — is in itself a remarkable fact. The idea of God, if it should be found in a single human mind, would deserve all attention. But it is found in many human minds — in so many human minds that we may characterize human nature, and difference it from the lower orders of intelligence, by its possession of this idea of God, just as truly as by its possession of the ideas of right and wrong. As this, however, is an important link in the discussion, and as it has been matter of controversy, let us ask explicitly to what extent, and in what sense, the belief in God's existence prevails among men.

We are all aware that there are certain truths which men universally accept without thinking of putting them into words, and without always being able to understand them when propounded in scientific form. Men who have no notion what you mean when you say that there is a principle of causality, that every action implies an agent, every change an efficiency that produced it, still show their practical belief in the law of cause and effect, by their language, actions and expectations. The formal denial of certain truths does not by any means prove that men do not believe them. Deniers of freedom like necessitarians, of substance like idealists, of their own existence like nihilists, all practically acknowledge what they speculatively deny. In the case of the fatalist, all that is needed to show this is the knock-down argument. The fatalist, knocked down, rises to vow vengeance or sue for damages — that is, he holds his assailant responsible — that is, he

recognizes, in practice, that the assailant's action is not necessitated but free. In judging of the evidence that the knowledge of God's existence is universal, it is not necessary to require that each human being should, on interrogation, respond that he knows that God exists. Though he may never have formulated his belief, he may still show by the language he employs, the actions he performs, and the expectations he cherishes, that he has the idea of a power above him on which he is dependent, an authority that binds his moral action, a personality whom he may address in prayer and worship.

Certain beliefs, moreover, which belong to man as man, are not developed in the earliest stages of the mind's growth, and that simply because the objects with which they have to do cannot be apprehended until the mind has reached a certain degree of intelligence. The moral ideas, for example, are apparently slumbering in the mind of the young child, but only because the notion of intelligent and voluntary action is not yet fully formed. The moment that conception *is* formed, you have with it another knowledge of right and wrong, derived, not from any experience of utilities, but from an original cognitive power of the mind. And even when once awakened, these beliefs are capable of indefinite education. They grow in strength and clearness. But the germ was there at the very beginning of the mental history, just as the full-grown apple existed in embryo even before the blossom had fallen from the tree.

We should not therefore be warranted in denying the universality of the knowledge of God's existence, simply because we found that this knowledge existed in children and savages in a rudimentary and undeveloped form. The mere fact that the perfection ascribed to the Being above them does not answer to our ideas of perfection, or the range assigned to the divine attributes to our ideas of infinity, proves only that the child and the savage have not yet expounded to themselves the contents of their own notions, — it does not prove that they have no real idea of God. So long as there does exist the idea of a Being above, of greatness and perfectness answering to the highest conceptions of which the mind is at the time capable, the rudimentary nature of this knowledge should not blind us to the fact that it exists,

With these precautionary suggestions, let us ask what is the exact state of the evidence with regard to the belief in God's existence. This is a matter of testimony. We find it to be simple historical fact, not only that the vast majority of men have actually believed in a God, but that there never has been an atheistic age or an atheistic people. Men in the mass have everywhere and always recognized a power, perfection, personality above them, though they have often clothed that power with wrong attributes. The race has bowed to priests more than it ever has to kings. The instinct of religion has been stronger than the instinct of either government or society ; for religious ideas have dominated in the formation and progress of both. Deprive men of one religion, they seek another. Abandoning the old gods, they seek new. Even Comte and Mill cannot be content without something to worship, and the one must deify a woman, and the other universal humanity.

Quatrefages, the French anthropologist, who has made this subject a matter of special study, says distinctly that, "obliged as he has been, to pass

in review the race of men, he has sought for atheism in the lowest and in the highest, but has nowhere met it except in an individual or at most in some isolated school of philosophers; everywhere and always," he says, "the masses of the people have escaped it." It is true that now and then reports are printed with regard to some savage tribe, like the Andaman Islanders, declaring that at last a people has been found who know no God. But closer examination has in most cases proved that those who seem at first sight destitute of such a knowledge do really possess it. Ignorance of the language and of the mental and moral habitudes of a people very frequently leads to these superficial and incorrect judgments. Moffat, the missionary to Africa, declared that he had found tribes who had no religious rites and no belief in a power above them. But his son-in-law and successor, upon further investigation, showed that Moffat's judgment was based upon imperfect knowledge, and that these tribes had both; Livingstone declares plainly, in so many words, that "the existence of a God and of a future life are universally recognized in Africa."

It would be easy to multiply witnesses, but there is no need. We are mainly concerned with the exceptional cases. In what way shall we account for the fact that individuals are not rare who profess atheism? Or, granting that some tribe like the Andaman Islanders were to prove destitute of any clear conception of a supreme Being, how should we explain this? Upon the principles already laid down. Either they practically admit what they speculatively deny, or their minds are yet in a state like that of childhood, in which the intellectual faculties are not yet sufficiently developed to permit the awakening of this consciousness of God's existence. David Hume was a professed skeptic, yet, when walking in the fields with his friend Ferguson on a starlit night, he exclaimed, "Adam, there is a God!" Even the degraded tribes which we have mentioned do indirectly manifest in various ways the existence in their minds of the idea of God, and its positive influence over them. The sense of responsibility, the notion of right and wrong, the reproaches of conscience, these are but reflections in the human soul of the authority and presence of God. Wherever there is fear after wrong doing, there is an implicit, if not explicit, recognition of the existence of One who hates the wrong and will punish the wrong. So far as exploration has yet gone, no tribe has been discovered that is utterly destitute of conscience. Until we learn of such, we must maintain that all men have, at least in germ and capable of development, the knowledge of the existence of God.

And this knowledge is certain to be developed so soon as the proper occasions and conditions present themselves, that is, so soon as the mind devotes the requisite attention to the considerations which demand the idea of God for their explanation. In contemplating existence as finite, there is inevitably suggested to the mind the idea of an infinite Being. In danger, men instinctively cry to God for help. When we speak of this belief as being universal, we do not assert that the existence of God is a truth always present before the mind. It is possible to engross the mind with objects which do not call forth the belief. Men naturally avoid the occasions which suggest it. What we claim is simply this, that everywhere and always, when the proper occasion comes, and the facts which require it for their

complement are presented to the mind, the knowledge of God's existence leaps forth from latency into power,— a storm at sea and the approach of death have dissipated many an atheistic delusion. It is this universal, though often unacknowledged, faith in the existence of a cause, a law, an end, above the merely transient and bounded beings which we see about us, that constitutes man's capacity for religion. Without this faith, there would be nothing to which religion could appeal. When we say that man is by nature a religious being, we offer the strongest proof that the knowledge of God's existence is universal. He who has not this knowledge, either potential or actual, may be idiot or brute, — he is not man.

For this knowledge, universal in the sense we have mentioned, we have to account. What is its origin? By what process have men everywhere acquired it? In attempting an answer to this question, it will be useful to review the various theories, and to pass rapid judgment upon them. First comes the theory which holds that the source of all our knowledge of God is external revelation, communicated to us either through the Scriptures or through tradition. It might be a sufficient reply to the first form of the theory — that which holds that we believe in a God because Scripture certifies us of his existence — to say that the belief in a God prevails to-day, and has prevailed for ages, where the Scriptures were never known. But it is a more vital objection still that the theory presupposes and takes for granted the very thing to be proved, namely, that God exists. Why do I believe in a God? Because the Bible tells me that he exists. Why do I believe the Bible? Because I believe that a God exists who speaks authoritatively in it. The Bible can be no authority to me, unless I have previous knowledge of the existence of a God from whom such a revelation can come. Just as a miracle cannot establish the divine existence, because it presupposes it, so the Scriptures cannot establish the divine existence, because they presuppose it. And especially so with a revelation handed down from generation to generation by word of mouth,— it can have no power to convince me of God's existence, unless I have from some other source a previous knowledge of a God from whom such a revelation might come. To believe in God's existence upon the ground of revelation, and then to believe in revelation upon the ground of God's existence, is to argue in an incurably vicious circle. And yet to just this, amount all attempts to account from external influences for the belief in God. "Religion in the world is a delusion inspired and fostered by priests." "Fear produced the gods." But a uniform fact requires a uniform cause. Something in the nature of man leads him to religion — else there is nothing for education, culture, priestcraft to work upon. Without such a demand in the nature, the religions of the world could never have been devised, received, believed, propagated. Some knowledge of a higher power must be presupposed to make either true or false priests possible.

Or shall we say that the knowledge of God comes from experience, in the sense of Locke's philosophy? Locke, we remember, held that all our ideas came directly or indirectly from the senses. They were either notions of sensible and material objects, or, combinations of these formed by the mind itself. Can sense-perception or reflection, then, account for the idea of God? We must answer in the negative, for the idea of God is not that of a

sensible or material object, nor is it a combination of such ideas. Since the spiritual and infinite are the direct opposites of the material and finite, no experience of the latter can account for our idea of the former. Does it help the matter to say that we know the existence of God from consciousness? No, because consciousness is only a con-knowing, an accompanying knowledge — a knowing of the mind's acts and states as its own. We are not properly conscious of facts or beings out of the mind. To say that we are conscious of the existence of God is simple tautology. It can mean only that we are conscious of knowing that God exists; and the question as to the origin of this knowledge comes up as before. The Germans, indeed, use the term *Gottesbewusstsein*, without being guilty of this tautology; but only because this *Gottesbewusstsein* means, not 'consciousness of God,' but 'knowledge of God.' *Bewusstsein* is, not a 'con-knowing,' but a 'be-knowing.'

Does the knowledge of God's existence, then, arise from reasoning? Since it is very frequently maintained that our belief has its source in argument, it will be necessary to consider this view somewhat more at length. We may appeal here to our own mental history, while we confidently affirm that the rise of this knowledge in the great majority of minds is not the result of any conscious process of reasoning. We say, in the great majority of minds. Some unquestionably do have this conviction wakened within them in the course of argumentative investigation, but even then the investigation is commonly reckoned as the occasion, not the cause, of the new knowledge. Among men who reason about God, the majority do not rest their belief in his existence upon argument, any more than they rest upon argument their belief in right and wrong. On the other hand, upon occurrence of the proper conditions, in hearing the thunder or being brought face to face with a past transgression, the conviction of God's existence flashes upon the soul with the quickness and force of an immediate revelation.

If the belief in God's existence were the product of reasoning, it would seem that the strongest reasoners should be men of the strongest faith. But we all know that the strength of men's faith in that existence is not proportioned to the strength of the reasoning faculty. On the other hand men of greatest logical power are often inveterate sceptics, while men of unwavering faith are found among those who cannot even understand the theistic arguments. Ask the mass of Christian people what is the foundation of their belief in God, and whatever else they may or may not say, they will refer its origin to anything but reasoning. The mass of Christians can no more follow the *a priori* or *a posteriori* arguments, than they can appreciate the demonstrations of a great physical truth like the shape of the moon's orbit, or the distance of the earth from the sun. Yet this does not prevent their having a knowledge of God. John, with his insight, has more faith than logical Thomas. And the converted barbarian has often a stronger conviction of God's existence than the undevout philosopher.

But it is time to examine the arguments themselves. It is possible for us to overrate the value of mere argument, even to the minds that comprehend and conduct it. I believe that a careful review of the chief arguments for the existence of God will convince us that, valuable as they are for purposes to be shown hereafter, they are not sufficient of themselves to demonstrate

the existence of the Being whom we call God. The arguments are four. Let us begin with the argument commonly called the Cosmological. This is not properly an argument from effect to cause; for the proposition that every effect must have a cause is simply identical, and means only that every caused event must have a cause. It is rather an argument from the contingent to the necessary, and may be stated as follows: Everything begun, whether substance or phenomenon, owes its existence to some producing cause. The universe is a thing begun, and owes its existence to a Cause which is equal to its production. And this mighty Cause must be God.

Now the chief difficulty with this argument is in the minor premise. It cannot be shown that the universe, so far as its substance is concerned, has had a beginning. Hume urged, with reason, that we never saw a world made. Science knows nothing of the origin of substance. Creation is purely a truth of revelation. It is "through faith" that "we understand the worlds were made by the word of God, so that things that are seen are not made of things which do appear." But we cannot use Scripture in our argument. Aside from the Scriptures, we do not know that the world ever had a beginning. Many philosophers besides Hume, in Christian lands, and the prevailing opinion of ante-Christian times, have held that matter is eternal. Or do we mistake the principle of causality? Does that teach us, not that every *begun* thing, but that *every* thing, must have a cause? Then God himself must have been caused. No. Our principle is right. A cause is to be postulated only for what has clearly a beginning; but the universe, so far as its substance is concerned, has no known beginning.

But have the phenomena of the universe a beginning? Yes, we see changes which come and go with every passing day. Do they not require a cause? Yes, but even here it is difficult to show that any other cause is requisite than a cause within the universe itself — a cause such as the Pantheist supposes. The Pantheist holds all change to be only modification of one universal, necessary, self-existent, eternal substance; and the Cosmological Argument alone cannot refute it. Or, if we grant that the universe has had a cause outside of itself, it is difficult to show that this cause has not itself been caused — that is, that it consists of an infinite series of dependent causes. And, if the cause of the universe has not itself been caused, it is impossible to show that this cause is not finite like the universe itself. We are warranted in assigning only a cause just sufficient to produce the effect. But what we know of the universe is finite. To say that it is infinite is pure assumption, — and it is of little use to assume an infinite to prove an infinite. From a finite effect, therefore, we can argue only a finite cause; and a merely finite cause cannot be God.

The value of the Cosmological Argument is therefore simply this — it proves the existence of some Cause of the universe indefinitely great; when we go beyond this, and ask whether this cause is a cause of being or merely a cause of change to the universe, whether it is a cause apart from the universe or one with it, whether it is an eternal cause or a cause dependent upon some other cause, whether it is intelligent or unintelligent, infinite or finite, one or many, this argument cannot assure us.

Let us consider, next in order, the Teleological Argument. This is not

properly an argument from design to a designer; for that design implies a designer is simply an identical proposition. It may be more correctly stated as follows: Order and useful collocation, pervading a system, prove the existence of intelligence and purpose as the author of this order and collocation. Since order and useful collocation pervade the universe, there must exist an Intelligence adequate to the production of this order, and a Will adequate to direct this collocation to useful ends. This Intelligence and Will must be divine. There are certain common objections to the premises of this argument which are clearly invalid,— for example, the objection that order and useful collocation may exist without being purposed; for we are compelled by our very mental constitution to deny this, where the order and collocation pervade a system. Nor is the objection that order and useful collocation may result from the operation of mere physical forces and laws any the more tenable, for the operation of physical forces and laws does not exclude but implies an originating intelligence and will. Before evolution, there must be involution. If anything is to come out, something must first be put in,— and if there is to be any certain progress to cosmos, instead of to chaos, there must be a guiding wisdom all along the line.

That order and useful collocation do pervade the universe is assumed in science. The physical investigator could not proceed for a day without taking it for granted that the methods of nature are rational methods, that the properties and qualities of matter are uniform, that all things have their uses. Let science busy herself with the *what*, as much as she may; it is the *why*, and the *prudens quæstio* with regard to it, that have been her most useful clues to nature's labyrinth; and the scientific imagination which Prof. Tyndall lauds, is nothing else than insight into the thought and purpose of which nature is the embodiment. We have evidences of this order and useful collocation in the correlation of the chemical elements to each other; sweep away all the proofs of intelligence in the existing universe; pass over all the intervening history,— go back to the nebula if you will; yet even here, an atom of oxygen is an atom of oxygen — an atom of hydrogen is an atom of hydrogen; and in the fitness of both to combine, with results so wonderful, you have proof of a designing intelligence. And this same intelligence appears in the fitness of the inanimate world to be the basis and support of life; in the typical forms and unity of plan apparent in the organic creation; in the existence and coöperation of natural laws; in cosmical order and compensations — the precessions and retrograde movements that from age to age secure the safety of the system, even while they seem to threaten it.

It does not invalidate the argument for intelligence to say that we often misunderstand the end actually subserved by natural events and objects; for the principle is, not that we necessarily know the actual end, but that we necessarily believe that there is some end, in every case of systematic order and collocation. Nor does it invalidate the argument to say that the order of the universe is manifestly imperfect; for this, if granted, would argue, not absence of contrivance, but some special reason for imperfection, either in the limitations of the contriving intelligence itself, or in the nature of the end sought. And just here Mr. Mill, in his posthumous essay on Theism, plants himself, and recognizing the blights and cruelties and devastations

of nature, the hurricanes that destroy the fruits of man's labor, the beasts that live only by torturing and devouring others weaker than themselves, the thousand blossoms that perish for the one that brings forth fruit, he declares that, if nature proves a God, it proves one who lacks either love or power; and, since there are signs of love, he who rules the universe must be a God in fetters — working with intractable material — bearing uphill a heavy burden that more than taxes his utmost strength.

But Mr. Mill's conclusion is not the only one. The Pantheist's conclusion is just as logical as his. So long as there is such a thing as impersonal intelligence, and we see the bee building her hexagons and storing for the winter, yet without self-consciousness or freedom, but bound to lines of necessitated action by its very physical structure and conditions, why, says the pantheist, may not the whole universe be only the unconscious work of a sublimer impersonal intelligence, that fashions forms of beauty and adaptation of means to ends, by an inexorable law of its own nature? And we must confess that either Mr. Mill's theory, or the theory of the pantheist, is logically consistent, and cannot be successfully combated upon the ground of the Teleological Argument alone. Leave out of the estimate entirely the self-consciousness, moral ideas, and free will of man — and we cannot prove, either that God is absolute sovereign of the universe, or that an impersonal intelligence may not suffice for its production. And as this argument cannot prove personality or sovereignty in God, so it cannot prove unity, creatorship, eternity, or infinity.

What then is its exact value? Simply this. It proves, from certain useful collocations and instances of order which have clearly had a beginning, or, in other words, from the present harmony of the universe, that there exists an intelligence and will adequate to its contrivance. But whether this intelligence and will are personal or impersonal, creative or fashioning, one or many, finite or infinite, eternal or owing their being to another, this argument cannot assure us. In it, however, we take a step forward. The causative Power, which we have proved by the Cosmological Argument, has now become an intelligent Power.

The third argument is commonly called the Moral, though we should prefer to call it the Anthropological Argument. It is an argument from the mental and moral constitution of man to the existence of a divine Author, Lawgiver, and End. Man's intellectual and moral being have had a beginning upon the planet. Material and unconscious forces do not afford a sufficient cause for his reason, conscience, and free will. As an effect, therefore, man can be referred only to a cause possessing self-consciousness and a moral nature, or in other words, personality. This is the first part of the argument. It is held to prove a divine Author of man's higher being. But there is a second part which argues from the existence of man's moral nature to the existence of a holy Lawgiver and Judge. Conscience recognizes the existence of a moral law which has supreme authority. Known violations of this moral law are followed by feelings of ill desert and fears of judgment. But this moral law, since it is not self-imposed, and these threats of judgment, since they are not self-executing, respectively argue the existence of a holy Will that has imposed the law, and of a punitive Power that will execute the threats of the moral nature.

"But why," says Murphy, "should we suppose conscience to be the voice of a will, or personal authority? Why should we suppose conscience to be anything more than the voice of impersonal reason, when it speaks on the subject of duty?" And Murphy answers his own question as follows: Because "unlike impersonal abstract reason, conscience speaks with a command. Reason speaks in the indicative mood; conscience in the imperative. The intuitions of the reason do not come into consciousness as if made known by a voice, but rather as knowledge comes through the eye, and do not suggest personality in their origin. A voice of command, on the contrary, at least suggests personality in its origin. It is this proof that has had greatest effect on mankind. "The heavens declare the glory of God,"— but they declare it only to those who believe in God. The light from the heavens is really the reflected light of conscience, though men often mistake its origin."

But beyond this, and as the third part of the Moral Argument, man's emotional and voluntary nature proves the existence of a Being who can furnish in himself a satisfying object of human affection, and an end which will call forth man's highest activities and ensure his highest progress. Only a Being of power, wisdom, holiness and goodness, and all these indefinitely greater than any that we know upon earth, can meet this demand of the human soul. Such a Being must exist. Otherwise man's greatest need would be unsupplied, and belief in a lie be more productive of virtue than belief in the truth.

Such is a strong statement of the Moral Argument. Its defects are that it cannot prove a creator of the material universe; nor can it prove the infinity of God, since man from whom we argue is simply finite. Its value is that it assures us of the existence of a personal Being, who rules us in righteousness, and who is the proper object of supreme affection and service. Among the arguments for the existence of God, however, we give to this the chief place, since it adds to the idea of causative Power (which was derived from the Cosmological Argument), and of contriving Intelligence (which was derived from the Teleological), the far wider ideas of Personality and righteous Lordship.

These arguments are the only ones to which we can assign any logical value as proving the existence of a Being above us whom we can in any sense call God. The Ontological or *a priori* Argument, from the abstract and necessary ideas of the human mind, has had currency in past ages, but is now generally abandoned. Because I have the idea of an absolutely perfect Being, it does not follow that that Being exists. If it were so, Kant's analogous argument might be valid: because I have a perfect idea of a hundred dollar bill, it would follow that I actually possessed one, which is far from being the case. And so we may come to a conclusion from the arguments as a whole. It appears that the *a priori* argument is capable of proving only an abstract and ideal proposition, but can never conduct us to the existence of real being. It appears that the arguments *a posteriori* which we have considered in detail, since they are arguments from merely finite existence, can never demonstrate the existence of the infinite. In the words of Sir Wm. Hamilton: "A demonstration of the absolute from the relative is logically absurd; as, in such a syllogism, we must collect in the

conclusion what is not distributed in the premises." And the same considerations apply to the attempt to explain our knowledge of God as an inference from the facts of nature or of mind,— for either this inference is what is called in logic "an immediate inference," and so is a mere restatement in other words of some proposition with regard to the finite and is not a process of reasoning at all, — or it *is* a process of reasoning, and so is only a condensed deductive syllogism, which, because it is condensed, may be expanded into regular syllogistic form. In this case, since it is a process of reasoning, it is open to the objections which have been previously mentioned.

But to all arguments for the existence of God, we have a still more radical objection to urge, namely that all reasoning presupposes the existence of God as its logical condition and foundation. Not only does the trustworthiness of the simplest mental acts, such as sense-perception, self-consciousness and memory, depend upon the assumption that a God exists who has so constituted our minds that they give us knowledge of things as they are; but the more complex processes, such as induction and deduction, can be relied upon only by presupposing a thinking Deity, who has made the various parts of the universe to correspond to each other and to the investigating faculties of man. Upon what warrant do I perform the simplest act of induction, and infer from one or more particular instances a truth universal in its nature? What right have I to conclude, from two or three facts within my observation, that unsupported bodies always fall, and that fire burns, and arsenic kills? Only upon the ground that the universe is a solidarity, that part corresponds to part, that laws of nature here are also laws of nature there, that there is a thought running through the universe, and that there is a thinker who thinks that thought. In the words of Dr. Peabody: "Induction is a syllogism with the immutable attributes of God for a constant term." Or as Dr. Porter expresses it: "Induction rests upon the assumption, as it demands for its ground, that a personal or thinking Deity exists." It has no meaning or validity, unless we assume that the universe is so constituted as to presuppose an absolute and unconditioned Originator of its forces and laws." And, as all deduction rests upon previous processes of induction or upon the intuitions of space and time, it follows that every sort and kind of reasoning toward the existence of God actually presupposes that existence, and begs the whole question in the very attempt to prove it.

Much new light is thrown from this point back upon our arguments for God's existence. We see that it is impossible to argue from man's wants to a supply, impossible to argue from conscience to a lawgiver, impossible to argue from adaptation in nature to a designing intelligence, without taking for granted that indications do not deceive us — that there is a correlation between the human mind and the universe, as well as between the human mind and the divine. Imagine an evil being to sit upon the throne of the universe, and to constitute all things so as to falsify our observations, expectations and reasonings, and all our arguments yield no fruit. It is because we take for granted that God is, that he exists in truth and righteousness, that the rational methods of the divine mind bear analogy to our own, that we are made in God's image,— it is because of these assumptions,

that any theism or any science is possible. In other words, we cannot demonstrate that God is, but we can show that in order to the existence of any other knowledge, men must assume that God is.

But a knowledge thus fundamental, necessary and universal, we call an intuitive knowledge. Of this sort we consider the knowledge of God's existence. We hold God's existence to be a first truth, like the conviction of our own personal existence, or the belief in causality, or the knowledge of substance as the reality in which attributes inhere and find their unity. But we hold this truth to be a deeper and more fundamental truth than any one of the others we have mentioned, and for that very reason the easiest to overlook and the last to be formulated. It is a knowledge which logically precedes all observation and all reasoning,—yet only reflection upon the phenomena of nature and of mind occasions its rise in consciousness. There is a prejudice against the doctrine of intuitive knowledge of any kind which arises too frequently from an imperfect conception of what is meant by an intuition. When we say that God is known intuitively, we do not hold that this knowledge will develope itself apart from observation and experience, but only that it will develope itself upon occasion of observation and experience. A first truth is a knowledge, which, though developed upon occasion of sense-perception and reflection, is not derived from these,—a knowledge which on the contrary has such logical priority that it must be assumed or supposed to make either sense-perception or reflection possible. Such truths are therefore not recognized first in order of time; some of them are assented to somewhat late in the mind's growth; by the great majority of men they are never consciously formulated at all. Yet they constitute the necessary assumptions upon which all other knowledge rests, and the mind has not only the inborn capacity to evolve them so soon as the proper occasions are presented, but the recognition of them is inevitable so soon as the mind begins to give account to itself of its own knowledge.

The doctrine of this paper, therefore, is that all men have at the very basis of their being, and as the deepest principle of all their thinking, a knowledge of the existence of God, as a Power upon which they are dependent, a Perfection which imposes law on their moral natures, and a Personality which they may address in prayer and worship. It is a knowledge, however, which more than any other has been dimmed and obscured by transgression, and by the loss of that love to God which is the condition of its clearest and strongest exercise. In an unfallen state, we may believe that it manifested itself as naturally and spontaneously as the intuition of self does now. God was seen in all things, and all things were seen in God. With the exercise of this intelligence, there was also the knowledge of affection and communion. But with sin, the knowledge of friendship and manifestation ceased, and only the necessary and intuitive remained. There is no longer an extensive knowledge of the divine attributes—no longer a seeing God face to face, only the cold, blank apprehension of fear, and the effort to rid the soul of the thought of God. But still in every mind the knowledge remains. It is dim, yet it burns—a light ready to flame forth in time of danger, or sinning, or judgment. It is like a choked-up well from which you have only to remove the débris, and the water that has been flowing so long in secrecy and silence can be seen once more and drawn up to quench the thirst.

And this is the object of God's twofold revelation in nature and in the Scriptures. Arguments drawn from nature and the human mind awaken, confirm and enlarge a conviction of God's existence, which may have been slumbering for lack of reflection. Arguments can never conduct us to God, or account for our idea of God. Both ends of the ladder are wanting. The top does not reach to heaven, since argument can give us not the infinite but only the finite. The foot has no firm basis on the earth, since all logic presupposes the existence of God and without this is invalid. Arguments cannot conduct us to God. They are not the bridge itself — they are only the guys that steady and strengthen it. Intuition is the great suspension-bridge that spans the gulf. The arguments are indeed only the efforts of the mind that already has a conviction of God's existence to give to itself a formal account of its belief. As such they will always be helps to faith, and means of bringing out into clearer light the deliverances of our inmost nature. This intuitive knowledge the Scriptures always take for granted. They never attempt to prove the existence of God. They address men as already knowing it. They bring a new revelation of the grace of God, and promises of a special work of God's Spirit, to turn this knowledge, which now is only a knowledge of intellect and of fear, into the knowledge of assured friendship and of sacred communion. Only in Christ are we brought back to our lost sonship and made possessors of that saving knowledge which is identical with eternal life.

But is a knowledge like this adequate to the purposes of science? When we know God by intuition, have we a right to use the materials thus gathered as foundation stones of theology? Herbert Spencer denies it, upon the ground that this intuition is, like all the rest, a mere accretion of past experience, a hereditary tendency of thought, a result of multitudes of sense-perceptions and awe-stricken feelings of past generations — trancendental for the individual but empirical for the race, a representation after all of the transient and earthly, a representation that in time may be outgrown. But this theory can be maintained only by wholly mistaking the nature and contents of the intuition itself. It is not merely a hereditary tendency, like that of the brutes, for the brutes have no intuitions — least of all, the intuition of a God. It is the intuition not of the finite or of the indefinite, but of the positively infinite; and this, as we have seen, can in no manner be derived from experience, either in the present or the past. Just as the idea of right and wrong can be explained by no combination of utilities, and the idea of cause by no combination or uniformity of sequences, and the idea of material or spiritual substance by no succession of sensations, so the idea of the infinite cannot be explained by any combinations or successions of the finite. For the very reason that it is too great an idea for so mean an origin, Herbert Spencer is obliged to reduce its scale in his representations of it, until it is small enough to be reasonably supposed to have emerged from the narrow aperture of sense. In other words, the intuition of God, and all the other intuitions, are explained by simply denying their existence. The trick is too old a one, and too fatal to Mr. Spencer's own system. For, if the validity of causation and of logical laws and of our knowledge of God be denied, what rule can save Mr. Spencer's belief in the Unknowable and in the Persistence of Force, the corner-stones of his philosophy, since these

are not truths of experience but postulates of the reason? And whither is philosophy tending, if the most fundamental knowledges of all, which it has taken uncounted ages to build up and consolidate, are to be proved utterly invalid by the latest research? In this doctrine, we have the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Spencerian philosophy. Evolution is proved to be a progress from knowledge to ignorance, from certainty to doubt. With the sweeping away of a single intuition, all the rest must also perish, for the mind certifies to none if not to all, and with them Herbert Spencer too, with his philosophy, must be consigned to the abyss of absolute skepticism.

There is another denial which we must mention — that of Sir William Hamilton. He virtually ruled our conviction of God's existence out of the realm of science by calling it faith, and then defining faith as that organ of the mind by which we apprehend that which is not an object of knowledge. Of course, if God is not an object of knowledge, then science, which *is* knowledge, cannot have theism for one of its departments. Now we accept the title of faith for the peculiar apprehension which we have of God. Notwithstanding this, we claim that this faith furnishes proper material for science. And that, simply for the reason that faith is not mere opinion or imagination, but a higher kind of knowledge. All physical science rests upon faith, faith in human testimony and in our primitive cognitions, but is not invalidated thereby. And why? Simply because this faith, though unlike sense-perception or logical deduction, is yet a cognitive act of the reason. Faith, in this lower sense, may be defined as certitude with regard to matters in which verification is unattainable. If the intuition of God is to be excluded from the realm of science because it is faith, then by the same rule must the doctrine of the uniformity of nature and the facts received upon human testimony be excluded from science also. Faith in God's existence is indeed a faith of higher rank than these, but it follows the same rule. The faith which constitutes the source of truth with regard to God is simply a certitude with regard to spiritual realities, upon the testimony of our rational nature and upon the testimony of God. The only feature that differences it from the lower faiths of science is the fact that it is conditioned upon the presence of a holy affection toward God. Yet even here we are not without analogies. There is a knowledge of the beautiful which is conditioned upon a love for beauty. Only one who loves beauty can ever see it, whether in sunset sky or on the poet's page. There is a knowledge of the morally good which is conditioned upon love for the morally good. Only one who loves moral excellence can recognize it in character, or truly set forth its principle and nature. So there is a knowledge of God which is conditioned upon love for God. Only one who loves God can see God or truly know God. As the sciences of æsthetics and ethics respectively are products of reason, but of reason as including in the one case a power of recognizing beauty practically inseparable from a love for beauty, and on the other hand a power of recognizing the morally right practically inseparable from a love for the morally right, so a scientific theism is a product of reason, but of reason as including a power of recognizing God practically inseparable from a love for God. This cognitive act of the reason by which we apprehend God, under the condition of a holy affection toward God, is faith. As an operation of man's higher rational

nature, though distinct from ocular vision or from reasoning, it is a kind of knowledge, and so may furnish proper material for a scientific theism.

A single question yet remains. If this right affection toward God be a condition of all scientific knowledge of him, in what sense can those who have no such affection know God, and what claim can such theism have upon them, since they lack the affectional conditions which alone can enable them to understand it? We answer that all men have a knowledge of God, dimmed and obscured though it be. A thorough and clear and vivid acquaintance with the truth, however, belongs only to those who look through eyes of love, and have their vision purged with the "euphrasy and rue" of divine revelation. But we can better answer by a parable. A certain man afflicted with cataract still perceived faint rays of light piercing the curtain that ever hung before him. He could tell daylight from dark, and the comparative dimness of his dwelling from the brightness of the outer world. One of his sons was an optician, and another was a painter. The father tried to understand their work and to help them in it, but he could not. What could the blind man know of lenses or of colors? At last he began to deny that there was any such thing as optics, or any such thing as painting. His sons vainly argued with him. They urged that the little light that reached his retina should be evidence to him that something existed outside of and beyond his eyes; that he ought to take their word for it that they saw shape and beauty where none appeared to him; that whole sciences had been constructed out of simple matters of form and light; that, with the cataract removed, he might see it all, and know it all, for himself. But the old man had been born blind; he believed nothing; he had no trust in oculists, as he had no trust in science; the veil before him grew thicker and his scepticism more inveterate, till at last with neither eyes nor mind could he see at all. Was there, therefore, no science of painting or of optics? and had these sciences no claim upon him?

VII.

THE WILL IN THEOLOGY,

OR, AN EARLIER VIEW OF THE WILL.*

We purpose in this paper to discuss the subject of the Will and its relations to Theology. Philosophy has no more difficult problem than this with which to deal. All agree that consciousness testifies to human freedom. But when this consciousness is to be interpreted, we find division. Some look so exclusively to the uniformities of man's action, that they settle down into determinism; freedom, to them, is but the seeming self-movement of the summer cloud, which is borne onward by forces external to it, and is driven by atmospheric currents even when it appears to be following an impulse of its own. Others eye so closely the central source of power within us, that they lose sight of the laws under which that power is exerted, and identify freedom with caprice; to them no act can be free which is the invariable sequence of fixed motive, and God cannot be free unless he is able to sin.

Fatalism and arbitrariness — these are the two extremes between which the pendulum of thought is ever swinging. Both of these extremes are represented in the schools of to-day. And let us frankly acknowledge that each has had its devoted adherents because each is the exaggeration and perversion of a truth. That is an easy philosophy which accepts the one and ignores the other, but it is as shallow and false as it is easy. It is a harder task to analyze both, and, after having set aside their elements of error, to combine what remains of truth into one consistent whole. But something like this must be done by every thinking man if he would attain to mental quiet, while to the preacher not only a consistent but a correct view of the will is indispensable if he would present the gospel with completeness and power.

And yet our method of investigation should not be the method of eclecticism. We may be taught by the past to avoid the errors of the past, but a clear and satisfactory result can only be attained by the new examination of the facts of consciousness, with the added help of Christian experience and of Scripture. We are not novices enough to believe that we can clear up all the dark places of this most intricate theme. We do believe, however, that the main features of a right doctrine of the will may be discovered and intelligibly set forth. Error has commonly arisen because inquirers have started from *a priori* and abstract notions of liberty or of law, rather than from induction of the facts of man's actual condition according to conscience and

* Printed in the Baptist Review, 1880: 527-550, and 1881: 30-47.

the Bible. Let our first aim, then, be this, to examine the facts, both as regards the ordinary operations of our willing faculty, and as regards its conduct in matters of morality and religion. Then, secondly, we may test the results thus obtained by their conformity or non-conformity with certain great general teachings of Scripture respecting God and man. Finally, we may inquire whether the objections frequently urged against our view are of sufficient force to compel its surrender, or can be met by counterbalancing considerations if not by direct refutation.

In asking what are the facts of the will's action, the simplest cases are the most typical and the most instructive. The other day I found my little son executing some curious gyrations about the room. "John," I said, "what do you do that for?" "Oh, I do it because I want to, father!" was his reply. Now my question and his answer give a complete formula for a doctrine of the will. I will take them for my text in what follows. The text teaches us that the human mind is the efficient cause of its own action. "I do it." John refers his action to himself as its author. And when we speak of John's will, we have nothing in mind but John himself, as a person putting forth power.

Let us observe a little more closely what John's attributing to himself power involves. It involves a consciousness on his part that his willing is determined by nothing outside himself. He knows that when he turns a somersault, he is not a water-wheel set a going and kept a going by an external force. It is he, in whom the effort and the motion originate. Here we get a glimpse of the indestructible barrier in human consciousness against all schemes of materialistic necessity. Man is not the product of climate and surroundings. External things cannot account for his volitions. The spring of action is within. His whole mental being rises up in protest against the doctrine that he acts only as he is acted upon, that his mental movement is determined for him by causes apart from himself and beyond his control. He knows that he is free, in the sense that he determines himself, and is the efficient cause of his own activities.

Absence of outward constraint then is only a part, and a small part, of the idea of liberty. Movement from within belongs to it also. John can say: "I do it," not only with regard to his bodily activity but with regard to the inward effort of his soul. His body may be in fetters, but his soul may be free. Even in confinement he may put forth mental powers in longing for deliverance or in planning an escape. The freedom of the will is shown in choice rather than in the execution of the choice. It is indeed this inward realm of mental energy to which we need to confine our attention. Not freedom in acting, but freedom in choosing is the inalienable prerogative of will. Take from me the power of originating *bodily* action, and I am still man, with mind unconquered and directing a thousand operations within. But take from me the power of originating *mental* action and I cease to be a rational creature,—I become as much a prey to influences from without as the stick or the stone. We call this freedom formal freedom, because it belongs to us as the very form of our being. So long as man is man, he cannot be divested of it. Hear John Calvin declare his faith in it: "I acknowledge," he says, "and I will always affirm, that there is a free-will, a will determining itself, and I proclaim any man who thinks otherwise a

heretic. Let the will be called free, because it is not constrained or impelled irresistibly from without, but determines itself by itself."

Thus my son's reply: "I do it," indicates his consciousness that his will, or his mind willing, is the efficient cause of his inward, and so of his outward, activity. But my question and the remaining words of his answer indicate also another complementary fact in his consciousness. I ask him: "What do you do that for?" He recognizes the propriety of the question, and replies: "Oh, I do it because,"—and then follows an assigned reason. Now this shows that while the will is an efficient cause of mental action, it is never an adequate or sufficient cause. In other words, the will never acts without some material to work upon, some reason for its activity, some end in view. This is little more than a repetition of those old maxims in philosophy: "An act of pure will is unknown in consciousness;" "Willing must have some object;" "He that wills must will something." Dr. H. B. Smith has well illustrated the difference between an efficient cause and an adequate cause, by the activity of the laborers in the building of a house. This activity is the efficient cause of the building, but it is not an adequate cause. Besides this there must be a material cause, in the shape of brick and mortar, and a final cause, in the end which the house is designed to subserve. So to call the will an efficient cause is by no means to say that mere will can account for any action whatever. There must be occasion for its activity and reasons for its effort. No power was ever put forth by any will, human or divine, with regard to which we cannot ask the question: "Why?" and with regard to which we cannot compel from the willing agent the answer: "Because." The real cause of an action is made up of two things: first, the power that did it, and secondly, the reason for which it was done. Or, to put it more philosophically, the adequate or sufficient cause is a combination of two elements: first, the efficient cause; and secondly, the occasional cause.

If the adequate cause of an action or volition be not a simple but a complex thing, we can see why one action or volition should be unlike another. The efficient cause, the will, is the same in both, but the occasional cause, the reason or end in view, is different. The fact that I have a will explains the fact of my willing, but it does not explain the fact that I will this rather than that. Particularity in the effect demands particularity in the cause. When I ask what is the cause of the uniformity of evil action in the case of an individual or of the race, it is not enough to tell me that the individual has a will, and that each member of the race has a similar faculty of volitions. I demand to know why this faculty acts wrongly with such persistent uniformity. When I ask the secret of a pure and consistent life, I feel it an impertinence to be told simply that the man who leads that life chooses to live as he does. The everlasting "why?" comes up again and again until it is answered. And when the advocates of arbitrariness declare that "nothing whatever" causes one man to put forth continuously selfish volitions, and another man to put forth continuous efforts of self-sacrifice, I feel myself disingenuously dealt with, and I declare that such a theory of the will wrecks itself upon the solid rock of our primitive conviction that every effect must have an adequate and sufficient cause.

My son John not only assents to this principle at once by saying: "Be-

cause," but he throws great light upon the nature of human volition, by saying: "Because I want to!" He asserts implicitly that want, desire, disposition, account for mental act or effort. He declares that while the ego, the will, is the *efficient* cause of his action, a certain wish, preference, affection of his is the cause which determines the *specific character* of the action. Now this is simply to say that every volition has its motive; that no act of will is ever put forth except in accordance with the soul's prevailing desire at the time the choice is made. Certainly, if a man has power to act without motives, it is a power which is never exercised, and we can have no scientific warrant for claiming its existence. Action without motive is irrational. What dignity or value is there in a wild contingence which may act unintelligently to its own ruin? This is caprice and craziness, but not freedom. It is immoral as well as irrational. You require that men shall choose for reasons, not without reason. Only as you assume that there was a motive behind the deed, do you regard the agent responsible. To maintain that indeterminedness is essential to liberty, to declare that in order to freedom man must have the power of acting contrary to all motives and of doing what on the whole he does not wish to do, is to contradict all experience and consciousness. Power to do what one does not desire to do, is not power, but impotence. Power to plunge into the abyss of sin, in spite of all inward tendencies to the good, only indicates that the soul has not yet reached true freedom. Freedom never shows itself except in the choice of what we like. When the love for honor is so strong that a man cannot do a dishonorable act, then he is most truly free. God cannot lie, but the settled love for truth that renders lying forever impossible to him does not abrogate his freedom. The truest freedom in God, and in the just made perfect, is identical with necessity. In short, I am free only when I act from motives and do what I want to.

But you observe that when John says "Because I want to," the motive of which he speaks is something internal and not external. Unless we steadfastly maintain this, we shall be avoiding the Charybdis of caprice only to fall upon the Scylla of fatalism. Let us remember that all motive, in the last analysis, is within. Suppose you offer to George Washington a million in gold, as the price of betraying his country. Will he accept it? No. But Benedict Arnold will. The gold is the same in both cases. What makes it a motive in the one case, and not in the other? Why, evidently, the settled preferences, affections and desires, which constitute the character of each. Thus we see that the causes of volitions lie, after all, wholly within the mind. Outward things have value and attractiveness, only as the mind seizes upon them with its desires, only as they are the objects of some want within. What we mean by the strongest motive is simply the bent of the mind, the fundamental and ruling preference. And in matters of morals and religion, this fundamental and ruling preference is of one or another sort, either a supreme love for self or a supreme love for God. Of whichever sort it is, it is the man's inmost condition and character; in short, it is the man himself. When his will acts, it acts under the influence of motives, but it is the character that makes the motives, and so we may truly say that the will always manifests the character. The inward affections which constitute the character may be so strong and fixed that the acts which take their

direction from them are uniformly good or bad. The immanent preference or moral bias of the soul may be so holy that a being cannot sin, or may be so unholy that a being cannot but sin, and yet this certainty of good or evil action may be the result of no outward constraint whatever. The will may be perfectly free, while yet the direction and form of the volitions are determined by the inward character.

Thus far I have spoken of the will as if it were simply the faculty of volitions. I have not thought it expedient to encumber my statement of the elements of the doctrine by anticipating the profounder and more unfamiliar phases of the will's activity. When we come to consider the will in its moral and religious aspects, we find that it fills a range of our being very commonly ignored, but far more extensive and important than that of mere volition. John intimates this when he says: "I want to." That is as much as to say that the person John puts forth another power than that of actual volition — namely, a power of wish, preference, desire. There is difference between these and volitions. The latter we are *conscious* of originating; we are *not* always conscious of originating the former. We put forth the volition; we find ourselves wishing. And yet we use not the passive but the active voice; we say: "*I* wish, *I* want, *I* prefer." We call our dispositions and affections voluntary, though we never speak of voluntary knowledge. The more we think of this underlying region in which motive chiefly originates, the more we see that here is the heart, the true self, here the most intimate going-forth of power. We perceive that there are optative states as well as optative acts, and that we hold others and ourselves responsible for them, in a way which would not be possible if the will did not consciously or unconsciously enter into them as a constitutive element. In short we come to see that to define will as the mere faculty of volitions is to regard only the most superficial aspects of it, while it is really nothing less than the whole principle of mental movement, conscious or unconscious, the whole impulsive power of man's being, whether latent or developed, and in its moral and religious aspects, the whole tendency and determination of the soul to an ultimate end.

Will, then, in the sense of the faculty of volitions, is always backed and preceded by will in the larger and profounder sense of the immanent preference of the soul, the moral gravitation of the dispositions and affections, in fine, the character of the man. So that we properly comprehend in the range of the will not only the executive acts, but also the settled appetencies in which the person puts forth power. The desires and longings of the soul are states of the will, and for them as constituting our inmost character, we feel ourselves chiefly responsible. I cannot separate myself from these inner impulsions. I cannot sunder the faculty of volitions from the directive powers beneath, simply because I cannot escape from myself. If these powers are evil in their tendency and product, I accuse myself as thus evil. When I see consummate pride and haughtiness in others, I condemn it because it is a tendency of soul that is wicked, whether originated by the individual's volition or not. There is a congenital and hereditary egotism and self-assertion, and we reprobate it without respect to its origin, because we feel that the "territory of vice and of virtue," to use the words of another, "is as wide as the mind exercised either voluntary or optatively."

Many of our dispositions and desires are but imperfectly conscious. Some of them we are probably altogether unconscious of, until some unexpected emergency reveals our character in action; but the whole stream of moral tendency, even apart from and below consciousness, is in the realm of the voluntary, belongs in this large sense to will, and involves responsibility and guilt if it be evil, as it is worthy of love and approbation when good.

If you have followed me thus far you will be able to see how freedom of the will may be perfectly compatible with the certainty, in any particular case, of a definite kind of action. The will as a faculty of volitions is an efficient cause, a *causa causans*, acting from within by a power of its own. But the will in this narrow sense is under law to the will in the larger and deeper sense, and the will in this last sense is a *causa causata;* the individual can never point to a particular volition of his own which caused his character. He causes, and he is caused. He determines, but he finds himself determined. He acts freely, but the direction of his acts is furnished by a voluntary nature that stretches away beneath his consciousness. He is a swimmer in the stream, but the current is strong, and the current is not something foreign to him — it is his real self, as much as his conscious efforts are. While no restraint whatever is laid upon him, there may be the most perfect certainty that he will act in one way rather than in another. The mean person may be incapable of generosity and the truthful person incapable of falsehood, because each freely acts out his character. In each case there is a moral necessity which is perfectly consistent with freedom. The formal freedom of the will, considered as the faculty of volitions, may still subsist, while yet the will considered as the underlying movement and current of the voluntary being is in bondage by reason of perverse and unnatural tendencies and inclinations. And this is the real condition of man — formal freedom, but a real necessity of evil — a necessity of evil, however, very different from the necessitarianism maintained by the materialist, which has its ground in things external to human nature — a necessity of evil which has its ground rather in man himself, and in those evil dispositions and desires which are states of his will, and which were caused by human nature itself when it first fell away from God and from holiness.

Ernest Naville has well said that man cannot cease to believe in liberty, because it is his true nature, nor can he cease to doubt his liberty, because he does not realize it. Put these two facts together, and you will avoid both the extremes of controversy. The will, as a power of putting forth individual choices, can choose anything not inconsistent with its previous fundamental choice or preference. Hence we grant what the old theologians call civil freedom. Every man chooses unrestrainedly the method in which he will act out his character. A thousand forms of activity are open to him. In any one of these according to his pleasure he may act or refuse to act. It is with this freedom in secular matters, and with this only, that so many of the moral philosophies of our day concern themselves. They are philosophies of man's original condition — of the metaphysical possibilities of his being. But they ignore a whole hemisphere of fact, when they profess to be exhaustive accounts of man's voluntary nature. Not man in an ideal abstract state, but man in his present moral state, is the man that we need to know; and real concrete man can be studied only in his acts and his consciousness.

And when we once begin this study either in ourselves or in others, we find that we must set side by side with this consciousness of freedom in volition another consciousness of a malign will beneath, that hinders persistent choice of the right and binds us to a deeper necessity of evil.

And so, when we ask the question whether this causative power of the will as the faculty of volitions is equal to the task of permanently reversing the underlying tendency and current of the will considered as the self-determination of the being to an ultimate end, experience must answer: "No!" Man has liberty,—liberty to enslave himself and to persevere in self-enslavement. His liberty is not ability to change his character at a single volition. Opposed to God and dominated by self-love as he is, he cannot of himself choose God and love holiness supremely. Self-love cannot throttle and slay self-love. The affections and desires remaining what they are, he cannot love God with all the heart. Let him make the effort, and he finds himself as powerless as a man standing upon the surface of the ground over one of those subterranean Kentucky rivers would be to turn back in its course the rushing torrent that flows beneath his feet. So man is at war with himself as well as with God. He has a formal freedom, but he is in real slavery.

The error of the philosophy we are combating is therefore the error of dismembering our mental nature, of sundering the powers from each other, and of imagining that will, as the faculty of volitions, can act alone. But man is a complex whole. Whenever he acts, he acts as a whole. In thought we can distinguish between his different powers and speak of their functions and products; but to suppose that the power of executive choice can somehow put itself outside of the man and secure a πού στῶ from which it may move the man contrary to his character, is an error only a little less grotesque than that of personifying the divine attributes and of supposing that Wisdom speaks to Holiness and Holiness to Love. And so we have a method of thought with regard to man's faculty of volitions, which regards it as severed from reason and from affection, fancies that it can act sovereignly in utter independence and disregard of motives, and believes that arbitrariness and uncertainty are of the very essence of freedom. And this is inseparable from and rests upon a narrow and defective conception of the will itself, which ignores that whole sphere of mental and moral movement which we call the preferences, the affections, the dispositions, the desires, into which we put more of power than we put into our imperative volitions, and which conscience holds us chiefly accountable for, because they constitute the real self, the real life, from which our outward acts spring and take their character.

I am aware that the philosophy of the will which I am advocating enlarges the sphere of will and of responsibility greatly beyond the bounds assigned to it by superficial thought. But be sure that this philosophy is the philosophy of the future. He who can content himself with saying that will is the author of volitions only, and that he can charge himself only with what he has personally and consciously caused, is like the early navigators who described the continent of Africa from what they had learned by touching here and there along the coast. He who, in his explorations of his own nature, has fought his way, like Stanley, through endless jungles and

malarial swamps and mountainous barriers and savage enemies, will have a sadder but also a grander understanding of what is meant by Will. To such a comprehensive philosophy of will we are coming by slow degrees. Schopenhauer and Hartmann in Germany, with all their pessimism and atheism, are bringing out, in their "Philosophies of the Unconscious," great facts of our nature which were never so clearly understood before. The fundamental thing in the universe, according to their systems, is not the Idea, as Hegel thought, but the Will. Not only is there unconscious *cerebration* and *thought* in our walking and in our sleep, but there is also unconscious *will* and the putting forth of *power*. The thoughtful and conscientious student of his own nature will recognize here the gleams of truth. The will is nothing less than the soul in movement or tending to move. And responsibility is coëxtensive, not simply with our volitions, but with the whole range of our active being.

In a recent French Evangelical Review (*Revue Chrétienne*, Jan. 1878 : 7) I find the following : "We have no initial power of determination. We can only yield to the divine impulse or to the attraction of sin. Our will is the effective cause of our conduct because these impulses solicit without constraining us. But our liberty does not consist in producing an action of which it is the only source. It consists in choosing between two preexistent impulses. It is choice, not creation, which is our destiny." The doctrine here taught harmonizes perfectly with the view thus far presented, and enables us to make an important application of it. The will has sometimes been called a creative first cause. There is plausibility in such a definition, because the will is a *causa causans*. But this is only the superficial aspect of the will. It is also a *causa causata*. The fundamental bias we find born in us. God is only *causa causans*, never *causa causata*. Let us then, with all reverence, reserve the title of Creative First Cause for Him who is the only absolute originator, and who can alone call substance, as well as activity, into being.

From this point of view we can also perceive the right and the wrong meaning of the current phrase : "the power of a contrary choice." The power of a contrary choice is possible if with the volition you include the motive, if with the act you combine the desire. There is indeed an abstract natural possibility of choosing in either of two ways. But as another has said : "Actual choosing is dependent on motives, opportunities, moral bias, the antecedent state of the will itself. And this generic bias, this moral habit, determines the special volitions until some great crisis comes "— comes, we may add, as the result of aid and renewal from without. We say sometimes to ourselves : "If I had this to do over again, I would do differently." Yes, if we could put ourselves back into the past with all the new dispositions and views which experience has given us. But when we ask ourselves whether, if we were put back there with just the views and feelings we had then, we should do differently, we are compelled to answer in the negative. But because we chose for reasons, and would not choose differently, we blame our choice. Our choice was none the less free and responsible because it was the natural sequence of our preceding dispositions. These preceding dispositions were ourselves. The will was in them. Being what we were we could not have chosen differently, but the power to choose as we did not

wish to choose, was not necessary to make our action free. Indeed, if we could have acted in disregard of all motive and reason, the choice would have been devoid of all real freedom. To be free to do what we do not wish to do is no freedom at all. It is to be the blind victim of chance, or to play the part of the madman. The power of a contrary choice, in the sense of a power to decide against one's character and against all motives operating at the time upon the mind, is a power which not only has no existence, but of which we have not even the ability to conceive. The only actual or possible freedom is the freedom to manifest our character in mental action.

It has not escaped your notice that we have thus far studiously avoided all reference to Scripture. It has been our aim to build up a doctrine of the will from the simple facts of consciousness. But we do not forget that we have a touchstone by which to determine its truth or error. The Bible does not indeed teach a formal scheme of mental science. Yet certain fundamental views of will are everywhere implied in it. Let us bring our results to the test of Scripture. But first we may in the briefest manner state what these results are. They are, *first*, that the will as a faculty of volitions is the efficient cause of mental action; *secondly*, that this faculty, though an efficient cause, is not an adequate and sufficient cause, but depends for its particular direction upon occasional causes in the shape of objects or reasons for its activity; *thirdly*, that these objects or reasons, which we call motives, are always, in the last analysis, internal and not external to the mind; *fourthly*, that the internal dispositions and desires which give to motives all their force, are themselves optative states of the soul into which will, as well as sensibility, enters as a constituent element; *fifthly*, that will must therefore be regarded as including not only the faculty of individual choices, but also the states of immanent preference in which the soul puts forth its power; *sixthly*, that since the will as an efficient cause is determined as to the character of its action by the will in the larger sense of the soul's fundamental preference, freedom in its executive acts may coëxist with certainty and even necessity as to their particular nature; *seventhly*, that though man has liberty in manifesting his character, he is unable radically to change this character if it be evil, or to reverse the self-determination of his being to an ultimate end, and that, because volition can never sunder itself from character, nor the man escape from himself; *eighthly*, that the will's freedom is therefore so limited by the law of its own character and condition, which it did not individually originate, that man cannot justly be called a creative first cause, nor be credited with a power of contrary choice in matters of morals and religion.

This view of the will, and the views to which it is directly opposed, we are now to test by the teachings of Scripture. And first, by the teachings of Scripture as to God's foreknowledge. By foreknowledge we mean the knowledge of something in the future that is certain to be. We must distinguish it clearly from ideal knowledge, or knowledge of what is merely possible. We can imagine God in eternity past to have had before him a multitude of plans for a universe. They are in his mind as merely ideal plans; he knows them all in their minutest details. But so long as no one plan is fixed upon and adopted, he cannot be said to *fore*know any of them, or any of the details of any of them. He cannot foreknow any one of these plans, except

when it ceases to be merely an ideal plan, and becomes a certainty of the future, and this certainty that the events included in it will take place can only be the result of his adopting the plan. The Scriptures declare God's absolute foreknowledge of the future. But that foreknowledge presupposes that the future is not simply ideally possible, or contingent, but is a thing of certainty, that is infallibly to be.

"But," we are asked, "does not God foreknow what he will adopt, and does not knowledge precede will in the order of nature?" I answer, knowledge of a thing as certain to be, cannot precede the fact of such certainty, for it would then be knowledge of what did not exist, and so would be a falsity and a delusion. And so knowledge of a plan certain to be carried out cannot precede the certainty of that plan, nor can it precede God's adoption of it, for this adoption is all that makes it certain. The knowledge which God has, before he adopts his plan, must be merely ideal knowledge of this plan among a variety of plans; it cannot be *fore*knowledge, for there can be no foreknowledge when there is as yet nothing certain in the future to be foreknown. The true order is therefore this: first, God's knowledge of various ideal plans; secondly, God's adoption of one of these plans and his consequent rendering it a certainty of the future; thirdly, his foreknowledge of the events included in it, as certain to be. So we perceive that the certain future existence of events is the condition and prerequisite of God's foreknowledge. In other words, what is not certain to be cannot be foreknown.

Apply this now to the doctrine of the will. If there be no certainty about the future free actions of men, God himself cannot foreknow them. The view which we have taken of the will permits us to predicate certainty of man's free actions, because they take their direction from permanent influences in the character. But the view opposed to this denies that there can be freedom where there is such certainty. It declares that the action that is certain cannot be free, and that the very essence of freedom is that the will is able to make an absolutely new beginning, and for the character of this new beginning no cause whatever can be assigned. Absolute uncertainty, perfect indeterminedness, on this view, is the only alternative to fatalism. Unless with precisely the same external and internal states and conditions the agent may just as easily make the opposite decision to that which he does actually make, the agent has no liberty at all. Now to this view of the will we simply oppose the Scripture declarations of God's absolute foreknowledge of the smallest decisions of his free creatures to the end of time. If he foreknows them, then they are certain to be. Uncertain things cannot be the objects of foreknowledge. Foreknowledge is of things to be, not of what may be or may not be. Even intuition cannot see what is not. God cannot foreknow what is not there to be foreknown. If there is nothing certain, then nothing can be foreseen or predicted, except that either this or that will take place, and a contingent foreknowledge is no foreknowledge at all. Omniscience does not make it possible for God to know things that are not objects of knowledge. Even he cannot tell what the results would be if two and two made five, or what would happen if chance ruled in the universe. But the theory we are opposing enthrones chance in the human will. And to declare that God can foreknow what this chance

will bring about is to declare that he can know nonsense and self-contradiction. Only upon the view that man's free actions are under the law of character, and therefore are out of the category of chance and uncertainty, can even the omniscient God know what they are to be.

Many of the advocates of the caprice-theory of the will perceive their view to be inconsistent with belief in God's foreknowledge, and in various ways attempt to justify their surrender of this fundamental article of our faith. One of the most notable among them (see Hazard on Causation, 213) intimates that foreknowledge is not essential to the supreme governing Power of the universe, protests his repugnance to the notions of election and decrees, fancies that God may adapt means to ends from moment to moment, and as he becomes aware of the necessities of each case, may draw out from his infinite resources the plan which he had devised to meet such an emergency should it ever occur. This writer conceives that the freedom of creatures may not have been possible except at the cost of a self-limitation of the divine knowledge,—God chose not to know beforehand what his creatures would do, lest he should impose fetters on their liberty. Does it occur to him, that upon the theory that the human will is necessarily an alternative power God did not need to limit himself, since he could not surrender what he had not, namely, the power to foreknow as certain that which is essentially uncertain? To quote once more from Dr. Smith: "God himself cannot see that to be *one and no other*, which is essentially and necessarily *one or another*." It is for this reason that the Socinians, with greater logical consistency, reject altogether the possibility of God's foreknowing free human actions. To Him, upon their view, the fall of Adam and the crucifixion of Christ would have been a surprise, had it not been that "coming events cast their shadows before,"—though even then how divine sagacity itself could have converted chance into probability, is difficult to say. Prophecy is nothing but guess-work. Even God may be disappointed, for there is no limiting the absolute uncertainty of the human will. What is this but to discrown the omniscient One, in order that man may have a freedom as wild as that of Bedlam itself!

Every such theory when tested by Scripture is found to contradict the express teachings of revelation. God foreknows all, because it is certain what human action will be. And human action is certain, because all men have character. Human character is not beyond the control of circumstances and influences which God has arranged and appointed. If man, influenced by man, may still be free, then man influenced by divinely appointed circumstances may still be free. Because we know something of the characters of our fellow-men and of the influence of their surroundings upon them, we are able to a certain extent to predict their actions, and statistical averages may be compiled, which shall make known to us beforehand their action in masses. All this witnesses that freedom is not inconsistent with laws and uniformities of action. It is only by observing these laws that we control our own mental powers or induce others to serve us. If we were wise enough, we could predict all human action. Much more is every human being "naked and open to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." How he executes his all-comprehending plan we know not. But we do know that he cannot resign his sovereignty. No creature can be inde-

pendent of him. Man's freedom cannot wrest the sceptre from his hand nor bandage the eyes of his omniscience. But God's sovereignty and his foreknowledge must both be surrendered, if the certainty of human volitions be incompatible with freedom.

In the second place, let us test the doctrine we have propounded by the teachings of Scripture as to man's responsibility for his native depravity. That man is depraved by nature and is condemnable for this depravity, the Scripture distinctly asserts when it declares that we are "by nature children of wrath." Nature here can mean only that which is inborn and original in contrast with that which is subsequently acquired. There is a congenital bias of the will toward evil, an unholy bent of the affections away from God, and a supreme preference of self, at the very basis of our moral being, apart from and prior to our consciousness. Upon this original depravity of the soul the wrath of the holy One rests. But God's wrath rests only upon that which deserves it. This nature therefore is justly condemnable and we are responsible for it. We will not multiply passages to prove that this is the teaching of Scripture, although we might show that this is God's own explanation of the universal fact of death, even in the case of those who have not come to moral consciousness, and his explanation likewise of the uniformity of sinful volitions in all men and all ages. Actual sins are the fruit, and actual death is the penalty, of a depravity with which we are born and for which we are notwithstanding held responsible. Nor is this the place to justify the Scripture teaching, although we could adduce weighty confirmations of it from the facts of history and from the testimony of most acute and holy men as to that human nature which in themselves and others they have subjected to so penetrating and pure a scrutiny. We might bring forward a multitude of witnesses from the ranks of law and literature and philosophy, and all of them outside the pale of professed Christianity, who would with one voice declare that they felt within them a fatal necessity of evil, a taint of nature below conscious choice, a moral gravitation to the wrong, which they did not personally originate, and yet for which, strangely enough, they are not able to shake off the sense of blameworthiness. Aristotle anticipates Paul's account of the evil law in the members, though he is not able, as Paul is, to answer the question: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" And Seneca in certain passages seems almost to echo David's words: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me."

Our present purpose is, however, simply to make plain the fact that this Scriptural teaching is consistent with the view of will which we have presented, but is inconsistent with any other. If our view be true, then man may be responsible for his nature,— for his nature is will. His whole being, in moral movement or tending to moral movement, is within the sphere of will, and for this current of tendency he is accountable, because it is his inmost self. But the opposing theory denies that there can be such a thing as unconscious will, and, limiting will to the mere faculty of volitions, maintains that no man can be responsible for anything that he has not personally and consciously originated. If it take the Pelagian form, it uses the phrase: "*Non pleni nascimur*," and calls the soul at birth a "*tabula rasa*," void of all evil whatsoever. Or if it take the Arminian form, it

speaks of a depravity for which we are not responsible except as we by conscious act appropriate it. The Roman Catholic can exclude concupiscence from the list of sins, because forsooth it is independent of our volitions. Thus nothing but presumptuous choices of evil, with the full consciousness of the law to be violated and a wilful determination to disobey God, is counted by many to be a sin at all. On this view, indeed, the only sin should be the sin against the Holy Ghost.

What we wish to point out most plainly is that the view of the will which we are opposing conflicts with Scripture by letting off the human conscience from the main part of the burden which God lays upon it in his revelation. Who can draw the line between the conscious and the unconscious? Who can tell what we have originated and what we have not? Are anger and lust always conscious? Yet the angry feeling is murder, and the impure look is adultery. Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, and the heart from which they come is evil. Sin is not simply an act — it is a principle of permanence and power, that reigns in the nature, that exists long before it revives or comes to light in the consciousness. These are the representations of Scripture, and we charge the view of will which regards it as the faculty of volitions alone with obscuring from men's minds these facts of God's word. If sin is only volition, and I can be responsible for nothing else, then sin has but limited range within me and but weak hold upon me. It cannot be so serious a thing as Scripture describes. And just in proportion as the sense of sin is blunted, does man cease to feel his need of pardon and renewal.

If man is responsible only for what he wills, and will is only his power of individual choices, it follows that God's law requires only what this will can render in the way of obedience. Law ceases to be the perfect transcript of God's holy nature, the ideal and unchangeable standard for all moral beings. It reduces its majesty to the limits of outward enactment and known enactment. Nothing that is beyond the apprehension of the blinded intellect or beyond the range of the enfeebled moral powers can be law for any creature of God. Thus law becomes a sliding scale of moral requirement, that lowers its demands as the sinner becomes more blind and debased and guilty, and gives up its claims altogether when he becomes totally depraved and beyond recovery. But is it true that the law has nothing against the man who has so sunk himself in sin that he has lost all power to obey? You know such persons; does God's justice absolve them and let them go free of punishment? The doctrine that man is responsible only for his acts of volition, and that power to do right is always essential to accountability for doing wrong, comes dangerously near to these conclusions. Those who hold this view of will are compelled to assume a "gracious ability" specially communicated by God, in order to render men guilty at all, and then to declare that for a great number of irresponsibles, tender in age or weak in mind or limited in opportunities, salvation must be a matter of justice, since they have no ability to obey. So there shall be some saved without Christ. Why should the lost suffer penalty when their power to turn to God is gone forever? A system of the will that leads logically to the conclusion that men are guilty only by virtue of "gracious ability," and approved when their sin has taken away all power of good within them, carries with it its own refu-

tation. It may not inaptly be described as a scheme in which men are damned by grace and saved by sin.

It is of course objected to our own view that to hold man responsible for an inborn state of the will which he did not originate is to violate all principles of justice and to expose Christianity to ridicule and contempt. We reply that if this is the teaching of Scripture, we may trust that God will vindicate his own truth. But it is self-vindicated also. A profounder philosophy of human nature is found to correspond precisely with the ideas which unlettered Christians had drawn from the Bible long before. We must not forget, moreover, that the modern scientific notion of the solidarity of the race is anticipated in Scripture, and furnishes the answer to the question how we can be responsible for what we have not personally and consciously originated. Men are not separate atoms, like grains of sand, or bricks set in a row. They are of one blood and origin, and are bound together in an organic whole. Look down upon the tree from above and you see only the multitudinous leaves in their isolation from each other. But look up from below, and you perceive that each leaf springs from a twig, and each twig from a branch, and each branch from a common trunk, and the great oak is only the product of a single acorn that the foot of an ox trod into the soil a hundred years ago. So the superficial observer regards the human race only as a company of individuals, and he denies all organic connection between them. But they are sprung from a common stock, and a common life is in them. The only explanation of universal depravity is the fall of the whole race when it existed seminally in its first progenitor. We have drawn our life from him, corrupted as it was by his sin. The will of the race apostatized from God when it was concentrated in one man, and of that self-depraved will we partake. So there is an individual responsibility and a race responsibility also, and any theory of will which regards it as the mere faculty of individual volitions must ignore a whole half of the facts and put it forever beyond our power to explain the great problem of our accountability for the depravity which we have in common with every member of the race.

We now proceed to consider a third class of Scripture passages which perhaps better than any other tests the truth or falsity of a doctrine of the will. We mean the teachings of the Bible with regard to God's initiative in human salvation. On the one hand, it is declared that man cannot of himself provide a salvation, nor lay hold of it after it is provided. On the other hand, God gives man all the power by which salvation is ever accepted, and from the first step to the last he claims all the glory. Of the first sort are passages like these: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil." "The carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." "No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." And of the latter sort are the following: "Who maketh thee to differ? What hast thou, that thou hast not received?" It is God that makes us "willing in the day of his power," that "gives repentance," that "deals to every man the measure of faith," that "creates us in Christ unto good works." We have not chosen him but he has chosen us. It is he who gives the new heart and the new

spirit. It is "of him" that we "are in Christ Jesus." We are "saved, not according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace." This salvation is "the gift of God — not of ourselves, lest any man should boast." It is only "by the grace of God" that we are what we are. No man has freedom but "he whom the Son makes free." Nicodemus asks what he shall do, and Jesus replies that "except a man be born from above, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." Those who believe on Christ's name are "born, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." "So then," says Paul, "it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy."

Thus, in endless variety of phrase, the Bible asserts that man's appropriation of salvation is solely of the Lord. And so we pray to God to save men, believing that their hearts are in his hand, and that he can turn them as easily as the tiny rivulets that irrigate the eastern fields are turned by the slightest motion of the hand or foot of the husbandman. We know that no heart is too hard for God to break, no will too obstinate for God to subdue, for nothing is impossible with God; he who created at the first can recreate at his will. We look back to our own experience and see that instead of helping God's work in us, we only resisted him; as the untutored Indian convert said: "I fought against him all I could, and God did the rest." We may have seemed to ourselves at the first to be wholly uninfluenced by God when we chose to enter upon his service; but subsequent experience has taught us that nothing but his power working secretly in our wills could have conquered our perversity and brought us to Christ. We say now of every stage of the process: "Not unto us, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory;" and the hymn of Isaac Watts expresses only the truth of our experience:—

"Why was I made to hear thy voice
And enter while there's room,
While thousands make a wretched choice,
And rather starve than come?

"'Twas the same love that spread the feast
That gently forced me in;
Else I had still refused to taste,
And perished in my sin!"

And in this mighty grace that not only offered us salvation if we would accept it, but which made us will to accept when otherwise we should have refused, in this mighty grace we place our only hope of personal salvation, our only encouragement to the work of the ministry, and our only assurance of the salvation of the world.

All this accords perfectly with the view we have supported, that the human will, with all its formal freedom, is yet in real slavery to evil, and possessed of no outlying and uncorrupted power by which it may separate itself from itself, in order that it may work down upon itself and change its character. If the will is the whole man with all his powers of movement and impulse, and this will is in one perpetual current and tendency toward self-gratification and away from God, then it is vain to speak of man's being saved by natural process of growth or development of some element of good within, or by any choice or coöperation on his part with the grace which comes to him from without. But all this seems foolishness to those who

maintain the theory of will we have been opposing. To them there must be always in the will the power of a contrary choice, the power of deciding against character. The Pelagian holds that there is no seated disease of the will, and that man may at any moment reverse the current of his wrong volitions and may become holy without help of any sort from without; while the Arminian, granting that man must have help, still claims that man has power to accept that help or to reject it, and that this acceptance, if it takes place at all, takes place in virtue of a freedom which still remains to him to decide as he will in spite of his character. Here are two men. Their characters are the same. Their circumstances are the same. The grace offered them is the same. The one accepts that grace; the other refuses it. The one is saved; the other lost. What makes them to differ in their decision and their destiny? Their own free choice, the Arminian replies. And so not to God, but to man, is due the merit and the glory of salvation. Man elects and regenerates himself. Before man's lordly will God himself stands powerless. If we would save men, we must pray to men, not to God. To use a rude metaphor, salvation is a two-horse vehicle, and man draws as much as God. In truth, God will never draw unless man begins. And as man can begin, so he can continue. Entire sanctification is just as completely within his power as is his first turning from sin.

Now this is a complete reversal of the true relation between God and man in the work of salvation. Man indeed is not passive — he is active; but then he acts because God prompts and sustains his action. No synergistic scheme which regards the human will as taking the initiative, and by its own power laying hold of and appropriating salvation, can find anything but refutation and condemnation in the Scriptures. And yet these false and anti-Biblical conclusions are the logical and necessary result of a theory which holds that will is a power of individual choices only, and that this power can be exercised sovereignly in independence of the man's previous character and condition. These conclusions are as irrational as they are unscriptural. The view that regeneration is the act of man, coöperating with divine influences applied through the truth, provides no way for the beginning of holiness. For so long as man's selfish and perverse affections are unchanged, no choosing God is possible but such as proceeds from supreme desire for one's own interest and happiness. But the man thus supremely bent on self-gratification cannot see in God or his service anything productive of happiness; or, if he could see in them anything of advantage, his choice of God and his service from such a motive would not be a beginning of holiness. Man cannot change himself. The depravity of his will, since it consists in a fixed state of the affections which determines the character of all the volitions, amounts to a moral inability. Without a renewal of the affections from which all moral action springs, man will not choose holiness nor accept salvation. Surely we must reject a theory of the will which equally denies the plainest facts of experience and of Scripture, and which would rob God of his crowning glory, by making man his own savior.

Still another and a last set of passages in the Scriptures is that which asserts the permanence of holy character in God and in the redeemed. There is a certainty of final perseverance and salvation in the case of every true believer. It is the Father's good pleasure to give such the kingdom,

and none shall be able to separate them from the love of Christ, or pluck them out of Christ's hand. So too, the Bible declares that God cannot lie, and cannot change. We rest upon these declarations as our great comfort and hope for the future. We trust in an everlasting love, and a mighty power, which will keep us through faith unto salvation, and will present us at last faultless, in the presence of the Father's glory, with exceeding joy. With all this agrees the theory of will which we have advocated. Volitions will follow character. No chance rules in the realm of will. Integrity will not lie. Holiness will not sin. Because God is God, and cannot change, he will fulfill his promises, and so confirm in goodness the wills of his saints, that on earth, those who have been renewed by his Spirit shall not fall away from their allegiance, and in heaven the just made perfect shall go no more out forever.

Character and its permanence, certainty of good conduct consistent with freedom, possibility of a moral necessity of righteousness — these are principles upon which we base all our confidence in God or man. But chiefly our confidence in God. For, weak and unstable as we are by reason of the two conflicting powers that move and work within us, we see no hope for permanence or rest in anything but God. But the philosophy we have been considering would shatter all our confidence, by persuading us that indeterminateness is the very essence of freedom, and that no confirmed goodness is possible. Since the will may always act contrary to motives and to inclinations, to influences and to character, not even God himself can make it certain that we shall not fall. Satan, it is said, had every inducement to maintain his allegiance to God, yet he apostatized. And beyond this liberty of indeterminateness, which is evermore upon the edge of the precipice, and is never certain that the next moment may not witness a causeless plunge into the abyss, beyond such liberty as this, the theory declares, there is no other conceivable or possible to God or man. The wild liberty of a Greek democracy is of a higher sort than a liberty regulated by law. May God save me from such liberty as this; for, if Satan fell and Adam fell, there are ten thousand chances to one that, unkept by God and unconfirmed in goodness, I too, sometime in the infinite range of existence before me, shall fall away from God and perish forever.

Indeed I know no reason for confidence, upon this view, that God himself will continue holy. Holiness is not a matter of nature, but of arbitrary will. There would be no merit or freedom in it, we are told, if God had not the power to be unholy. Dr. Dwight* considers that if sin produced as much good as virtue, it would be as commendable as virtue is, in either God or man. There is no certainty that God will abide in righteousness; for he has free-will, and the essence of free-will is uncertainty. And so we have from Dr. Whedon such sorry utterances as these that follow: "Whether God could not make himself equally happy in wrong is more than we can say." Nor can we say "whether the motives may not at some time prove strongest for divine apostasy to evil." Ah, how much these philosophers are willing to sacrifice for a theory! Would that they could perceive the deeper philosophy that lies under those grand and simple formulas of

* Works, 3: 159.

Augustine. Man was created, he would say, with a *posse non peccare*. But this was accompanied by a *posse peccare* also, and so it was only child-like innocence, but not confirmed virtue. Through trial and temptation, his true calling was to transform this freedom to sin or not to sin, into perfected holiness — the *non posse peccare* which belongs to God and to the elect angels. Then good would have become the law of his being. Holiness would have been so inwrought into his character, that freedom of will, for him, would have been identical with the necessity of good. But he fell; and instead of the blessed *non posse peccare*, there resulted the dreadful necessity of evil, the *non posse non peccare*, which is identical with moral slavery and ruin. The scheme of Augustine is profounder and truer and more Scriptural than that of Arminius. The doctrine that man may fall from grace, and God may fall from holiness, however ably it has been supported, and however piously its advocates have lived, does yet tend to the making of weak and unstable Christians, in whom weakness and instability are combined with self-sufficiency and small sense of their dependence upon God. But the true idea of freedom as ability to conform to the divine standard, and the certainty that the believer will attain to it and exemplify it in the perfect state which we are soon to enter, this gives nerve and cheer, and tends to the making of reverent and trustful and humble and persevering disciples. But this is not the chief merit of the view that volition is inseparable from character. Its chief merit is that it stands the test of Scripture and proves itself to be the philosophy of the word of God.

We have thus expounded our view of will, and have tried it by the standard of revelation. It only remains to mention the most striking objections that have been urged against it, and to show, if possible, that they are insufficient to invalidate the considerations urged in its support. For lack of space, our treatment of them must be very summary, but we shall endeavor to make it candid and sufficient. First, then, it is urged that the mind must have the power of acting without motives, because men do actually choose between things precisely equal and similar, and because God actually adopts one plan out of many of equal value, and elects one man while he passes by another of no less worth than he. Now I think it will be granted by all, that these cases, if they exist, are rare and exceptional ones, and do not reveal the ordinary law of the will's working. They do not therefore overturn our previous reasoning, the aim of which has been to discover the general principles of a theory of the will. Furthermore, we all know that in the case of human action, the instances where motives are apparently evenly balanced are always in matters of utter insignificance; at any rate, we never act in the weightier affairs of life, without seeing at least some reason for deciding in one way rather than another. But passing these considerations as merely preliminary, we make the general and broad denial that motives are ever, in human affairs, evenly balanced. There is always some preference which the man follows even in touching with his finger one of two squares on the checker-board, or else he chooses to put down his finger without knowing where it will rest. In either case it is absurd to suppose he puts his finger where he does not wish to, and if he does put it where he wants to put it, then he follows some motive, even though it be nothing more than this, that a certain square first strikes his eye or is nearest to his hand. The motive

is there, though it may be in the man himself, not in the squares, when these do not differ from each other. And so our judgment is that the ass that starved between the two bundles of hay, because the attractions of each were so exactly balanced as to keep him in a state of stable equilibrium between them, was indeed an ass. Thus far we have spoken of man. But the case is not essentially different when we apply the principle to God. We cannot believe that he chose a less worthy plan of the universe in place of a more worthy, for this would deny his benevolence as well as his wisdom. We therefore say that of many plans he chose the present — not without reason, but for reasons inscrutable to us. So God chooses one man to eternal life, not because of anything in him, but for reasons which exist only in God and which are unrevealed to us. The reasons why I choose one of two precisely similar gold pieces, are external to the gold pieces themselves. The reasons are in me, in my physical condition or my feelings at the time. But there are reasons, and the choice is never an act independent of motives. So God may choose between plans and between men, for reasons internal to his own nature. To assert that God chooses without reasons is to deny his wisdom. To assert that his reasons must be found in things external to himself, or that these reasons must be comprehensible to us, is to ignore, on the one hand, his likeness to men, and on the other hand, his infinite elevation above them. To deny that God may have reasons within himself even in choosing between things which, considered as merely external to himself, are equals, is to deny the possibility either of external creation or of movement of any kind within God's nature. For God is infinite and self-sufficient. He does not create to satisfy any want in himself, for he has no want to be satisfied. He does not create to increase his glory, but to reveal his glory. But if creation and non-creation are equally consistent with his blessedness, then he must create for reasons in himself alone. Any other principle would deny the existence and possibility of any thought or movement whatever in God, and render him as "idle as a painted ship upon a painted ocean," a veritable Buddha, devoid of all consciousness and personality. We should not be willing to go to these lengths even to save a good theory of the will; we certainly are not willing to go to these lengths for the sake of saving a bad one.

A second and more serious objection to our doctrine is, that upon this view, the first man, since he had a holy disposition, could never have sinned. We must either maintain, it is said, that Adam was created with an already corrupted will, which would throw the blame of his sin upon his Creator, or that he never fell at all, which would contradict our general scheme quite as much as it contradicts Scripture. We acknowledge that here, as well as in the divine permission of moral evil, there is a difficulty which we cannot fully solve. But we claim that the difficulty does not lie where the opponents of our view imagine, and that what difficulty does exist is by no means so vital and perilous as that which attends the scheme which they themselves maintain. We would begin our reply by freely acknowledging that there is a sense in which we must allow that our first father had the power of contrary choice. He was created pure, and might have maintained his integrity. He actually fell, and so possessed the power of choosing evil. Here were power of good and power of evil in one and the same being. In this sense,

Adam had the power of contrary choice — had it in a sense in which none of his descendants naturally have it; if they have it at all, it is as the result of divine grace, which puts side by side with the natural tendencies to sin, other and, on the whole, dominant tendencies to holiness. But this power of contrary choice which Adam possessed was not the nondescript and absurd faculty which our Arminian friends understand by the name. It was not an ability to decide without motives or contrary to all motives. It was not a self-contradictory ability to choose what he did not wish to choose, or to choose what on the whole he did not want. Adam's choice of evil, then, does not prove that he chose without motive or contrary to motive, and so his choice does not in the least help the philosophy of our opponents. The difficulty in the case is not in imagining how Adam could choose without or against motive, but in understanding how sinful motive could have found lodgment in a heart already prepossesed with a concreated disposition to holiness. Adam chose evil because he wanted to. How could he want to choose it? — that is the real question.

Partial and insufficient explanations of this great fact have been attempted. The fact of Satanic temptation has been urged as accounting for the fall. The adversary, it is said, deceived our first parents, and this deception furnished the force needed to counterbalance their natural tendencies to good. But this is rather a hiding of the difficulty than an escape from it. For their yielding to such deception presupposes distrust of God and alienation from him. And then, even if this were a sufficient answer as respects Adam, it would only remove the problem one step further back. For Satan's fall, or at least, the fall of the first created spirit that apostatized, cannot be explained by temptation from without. To say that God creates any finite being with original disposition to evil, is the greatest of blasphemies, for it denies his holiness and makes him the virtual author of sin. Sin is the wilful revolt of the free creature from God. At his own door, and not at the door of God or of any fellow-creature, the blame of it must be laid.

A more plausible explanation is that which regards the fall as due to the withholding of supernatural grace, and so to be a demonstration that even free and pure intelligences must have their life in God, and cannot maintain their integrity without him. The grace given to Adam, it is said, was assisting grace, which he could use or not, as he willed. The grace given to us is grace that makes us will, and will aright. That only assisting grace, and not overcoming grace, was given to Adam, was not a penalty, but a tribute to his strength and perfection, which was naturally equal to the task before it. Now, grace is omnipotent, because nature is wholly without power. Then, grace was weak, because nature was strong. We recognize a measure of truth in this view. Irresistible grace certainly cannot be claimed as a matter of right by free creatures, perfectly endowed and naturally able to keep God's law. It makes the fall somewhat more intelligible, by its suggestion that the first sin was the inward withdrawing of the affections from God and consequent self-isolation of the spirit from the ever-ready influx of divine love and power. But the "why?" still remains unanswered, and the "how?" is still unexplained. What motive to withdraw from God? And if the motive be assigned, whence could the motive come? The mere power of choice does not explain the fact of an unholy choice. The fact of natural

desire for sensuous and intellectual gratification does not explain how this desire came to be inordinate. We must acknowledge that we cannot understand how the first unholy emotion could have found shelter in a mind that was supremely set on God, nor how temptation could have overcome a soul in which there were originally no unholy propensities to which it could appeal.

But it is something to show that there may be reasons why this matter is beyond our comprehension, and that the difficulty is a greater stumbling-block in the way of the opposite theory of the will than it can possibly be upon our own. Let us remember that the matter in question is the origination not of a single volition, nor of one disposition among many, but of the fundamental bent and determination of the whole moral being. Such revolution of the nature, such change in the whole direction of the conscious and unconscious powers, we have no experience of, except in regeneration, when this fundamental bent of the affections and will is reversed. But even of this we can hardly be said to have experience, because it is wrought not by us but by God, and that so secretly and inscrutably, that we know nothing of it except in its results of conversion, or the voluntary turning of the soul, on our part, to God. Even this conversion is a unique thing, never wholly explicable, even to him who turns; but God's work is all a mystery. And yet, this act of turning back to God, that occurs only once in a lifetime, is the only incident of our experience that affords even the most distant analogue to that first supreme and unique act, by which in our great ancestor, all that there was of human nature turned away from God. It was an apostasy which could occur but once. It occurred in Adam before the eating of the forbidden fruit, and revealed itself in that eating. The subsequent sins of Adam and of ourselves are different in kind. They do not, as that did, determine or change the nature — they only show what that nature is, and and bring out more or less distinctly its inner capacities of evil. It was the one leap over the precipice. Once taken, it could never be undone. And because man cannot leap back again to the height from which he has fallen, but must lead his life far below, he finds it impossible to comprehend the nature or the possibility of that act, by which the race once for all left its first estate and gave itself to evil. Therefore we accept the doctrine of the fall without comprehending the method of it. But for the very reason that we do not comprehend it, we refuse to draw from it inferences prejudicial to facts indubitably ascertained from consciousness and from the word of God. We still claim, that however man's evil disposition first arose, there was an evil disposition, not derived from God but originated by man, in spite of holy tendencies with which God endowed him, and that therefore man sinned from a motive which God was able to foresee, and against whose results he was able to provide.

Do our opponents, the advocates of a capricious will, know more about the matter than this? Are they able to show that their theory removes the difficulties of the case? On the contrary we are persuaded that upon their view there is left no real responsibility for sin at all, and if there were responsibility, no possibility of foreseeing it or providing a salvation from it. For, consider, on the one hand, that this first most dreadful and most damning sin of all, was committed not only without motive but against

motive. It was not only an unreasonable but an unreasoning act. There was no aim in view, no object sought, no desire to be gratified, which determined the kind and direction of the sinful volition. We say then that the volition was not sinful. No act is to be condemned, except as it is regarded as originating in, and as symptomatic of, an evil disposition. It is the settled principle of civil law, that crime does not consist alone in the external act. There is no crime, unless with the act, goes an evil motive or intent. We apply this principle to Adam's sin, and we declare, that to call that sin a motiveless and uncaused act, originating in the pure sovereignty and creatorship of Adam's mere faculty of volitions, is to deny that he sinned at all, and to turn the whole momentous transaction upon which the world's fate hung, into mere chance or madness, that could bring no guilt to Adam and no just consequences of sin or misery to the race.

Nor could such an act of bare caprice have been foreseen or provided for. If there was no motive, there was no certainty. If there was no certainty, there was nothing to be foreknown. If there was nothing to be foreknown, foreknowledge was impossible. What then means the fitting up of the world with all its dark draperies of storm and suffering, of malformation and of blight, of thorns and thistles, of internecine war among the brute creation, and the feeding of life upon life, that marked the ages before Adam? This looks as if man's coming and man's sin had been positively foreseen, and an arena had been fitted up, congruous with the great drama that was to be enacted. Above all, what means that revelation of the heart of God before creation, which is given us in those words: "The Lamb slain before the foundation of the world;" and what mean those declarations that in this Christ we were "chosen before the world was?" These things indicate that the atonement and the application of the atonement were certainties before the curtain of night and chaos rose in the beginning. But if these things were certainties, says the theory, Adam could not have been free. To which we can only reply: So much the worse for a theory of freedom, which regards it as a synonym for caprice, and divorces it from the directing power of motive.

We come now to the last objection which needs an answer, this namely, that upon the view which we have set forth, man can do nothing to change his character. The power to alter our dispositions and to improve our principles of action, it is said, even though we be destitute of God's saving grace, is recognized in all processes of education, whether in the school or the family, and is the presupposition of all systems of civil and criminal administration. Now, in reply to this, it would be enough to say that our theory of the will makes room for the possibility of all these changes, so long as the fundamental motive remains the same. We have granted the fact of civil and secular freedom. Every man has the power of doing as he pleases, and of acting out in his individual choices the character within him. That character is a self-centred and self-seeking character. But there are a thousand ways of manifesting self-will, and of reaching self-gratification. And as widening knowledge presents new avenues for selfish activity, or more promising means of self-exaltation, the fundamental tendency of the will asserts itself in ever-varying choices. The indolent man, with new prospects of wealth opening to his view, may become a man of industry, and the drunkard,

aroused to see the misery that lies before him and his family, may reform and become sober. Nay, we go further, and grant that there may be advances to forms of character of high intellectuality and of vast service to human welfare and progress, while yet the heart is unchanged, and the man is in spirit far from God. The gentleness of the worldly man may even simulate the grace of Christian love, and the steadfastness of worldly integrity may be mistaken for Christian principle, yet no power be at work but the self-contained and self-regarding principle that lies at the basis of the natural character.

Now all this possibility of growth in good we grant, so long as it is allowed that the human will cannot go further, and change the fundamental affection which constitutes its inmost character. We may grow in moral evil, by natural process, but not into true moral good. For moral good and natural good are two very different things. Moral good, in the sense in which we use the term, is only the fruit of the truest motive, love to God. And even the first beginnings of moral good are impossible without the inworking of the Holy Spirit. Man can choose between different ways of manifesting his natural disposition and determination; he may repress certain tendencies to evil, and may secure a growth in useful habit. But all the while, the inner motive of his striving will fail to be the highest motive, and his character will fail to meet the divine approval. This motive and this character, no power but God's can change. But can he not bend his mind to truth, and bring before him the force of outward facts that tend to enlighten and soften and subdue? Abstractly, yes. Practically, no. He has the natural power of attention, but alas, he will not attend. What is needed is, not new light on the picture, but the removal of the cataract which prevents him from seeing the picture. What is needed is, not volitions, prompted by the old selfish desire for his own interest and welfare, but a new affection towards God, which will make him, in the deepest fountain of his being, conformed to the divine holiness and empowered to the doing of God's will.

And this need of a new principle and motive, such as only God can give, is what the theory of will we are opposing, constantly tends to ignore. Would that its advocates could learn the humility and dependence of spirit which would enable them to understand this truth aright! You remember that when John and James, two brothers dear to our Lord, but not yet taught by the Spirit as they were a little after, came to Christ and besought the high places in his kingdom, Jesus put to them the searching question: "Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Little did they know of the mighty and awful import of those words — the cup of suffering in Gethsemane and on Calvary, and the baptism of death and the grave that was to follow. But the question daunted them not. In their profound ignorance of Christ and of themselves, they said with a light and cheerful sense of independence and of power: "We are able!" How wonderful it is that Christ's rebuke was so gentle, how wonderful that he accepted even this self-ignorant and self-trustful determination to follow him, and then, taking the will for the deed, by his mighty Pentecostal Spirit made the deed equal to the will, so that James drank gladly the bitter cup of martyrdom, and John's long century life-time was baptized into the spirit of the Savior's death! But has man nothing to do

then in his own salvation? Yes, I say; but it is with the ability that God giveth. God works, not before our working, but in and through our working. And he has shown men what is the work of God, namely, that they believe on Christ, his only begotten Son. This is man's duty, this is man's privilege, the moment the gospel message comes to him. The change of character is wrought by God's power alone, in and through man's trust and submission to the Savior. It is the old story of the withered hand. Was there ability there? Was the man wholly unresponsible for obedience until his hand was healed? Should he delay to stretch it forth, until Christ had wrought his cure? Ah, he might have waited forever without being healed, if he had held a certain theory of the will that we know of. Nay, there was duty there, before there was power; yet the healing did not follow upon obedience, but communicated the very power to obey. So there are lost men, whose moral nerves are shrivelled and powerless, and their very capacity of obedience gone. Without a renewal of their wills, they will not, they cannot, accept salvation. Yet we are bidden to go and preach to them that they turn at once from their iniquities and believe in Christ. Thank God, though they have not the power to change their characters, there is a divine Spirit who can do this work, and who, with our word of command and invitation and promise, will energize the impotent will, and will cause it to rouse itself from its slumber of death, and to put forth new and God-given powers of life and spiritual freedom!

VIII.

MODIFIED CALVINISM,

OR, REMAINDERS OF FREEDOM IN MAN.*

What is freedom, and how much of freedom, if any, is left to us in our unregenerate state? Dr. Shedd has well said that the answer to this question, more than to any other, determines a man's position in theology. I have become convinced that the theory of Jonathan Edwards, with which Calvinism is so often identified, is in certain respects, too narrow a one to embrace all the facts, and that Calvin himself, as well as Augustine before him, held a somewhat broader and a more Scriptural view of human liberty. As I propose, however, to test the subject in my own way, and as Edwards, Calvin, Augustine, and their particular opinions, are of little account except as they may guide us to the truth or warn us of error, I will for the present leave them to themselves and will come at the real subject of investigation from another quarter.

We cannot properly estimate man's freedom in his estate of sin without comparing it with some ideal standard. What is man's normal freedom? In a perfect moral state how will this freedom manifest itself? Two or three answers at once suggest themselves. The highest freedom is not simply an absence of external or internal constraint — of the necessity of willing evil. Nor is it a mere self-determining indecision, evenly balanced between good and evil, and equally ready to walk upon the heights of virtue or to plunge into the abyss of sin. It is rather such an inworking of law into the heart and soul of a man, that there is a spontaneous and infallible choosing of the right. The German poet did well when he rejected every vestige of moral indecision from his notion of freedom: —

> "In vain shall spirits that are all unbound
> To the pure heights of perfectness aspire;
> In limitation first the Master shines,
> And law alone can give us liberty."

No instructed Christian can fail to see, moreover, that the law which is thus inwrought into man's heart and soul must be "the law of the Spirit of life," and not something merely abstract and impersonal. True freedom, in other words, involves an indwelling and inworking of God in man. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there, and there only, is liberty. There is no true freedom of the human spirit but in being the conscious, voluntary executor of the will of the Infinite One; aye, more than this, in being interpenetrated, informed and energized by the living God. "Here," in the language of a noted writer, "is the Christian paradox. I am to feel myself

* Printed in the Baptist Review, April, 1883.

passive in the hands of God, yet on that very account the more intensely active. I am to be moved unresistingly by God, like the most inert instrument or machine, yet to be for that very reason all the more instinct with life and motion. My whole moral frame and mechanism is to be possessed and occupied by God, and worked by God, and yet through that very working of God in and upon my inner man, I am to be made to apprehend more than ever my own inward liberty and power. This is the true freedom of the will of man, and then only is my will truly free, when it becomes the engine for working out the will of God."

If this be the true notion of freedom in man's state of perfection — if, even at man's best, there can be no freedom without God — can man in his fallen state be less dependent? We grant that man can work evil without God, but can he work anything which is truly good? Surely not. In a fallen state man is solely responsible for evil, but not he alone is to be credited with good. That is due to God. Good King Alfred, with laboring quaintness of phrase, tried to express this truth more than a thousand years ago: "When the good things of this life are good, then they are good through the goodness of the good man who worketh good with them, and he is good through God." But the fountain-head of all this doctrine is in the utterance of the Apostle Paul: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure."

And yet, if Paul were not an inspired apostle, such an utterance might seem a piece of sublime audacity. Here are two truths, so far as human reason can see, irreconcilable with each other, yet both asserted in the same breath and without the slightest intimation that the apostle is aware of any contradiction between them. Divine sovereignty and efficiency on the one hand, and human freedom and responsibility on the other. God the worker of all good, yet man called upon to work out his own salvation. We are usually content to hold each of these truths at different times, and we are greatly perplexed when we are required to grasp both of them together. We are like the child who tries at the same moment to hold in its little hand two oranges. It can hold one, but so surely as it attempts to take up the other, it is compelled to drop the first. So God's working and man's working are both of them truths, but our intellects are too infantile as yet to be able at once to grasp them both.

Cecil once said in substance that the preacher who preached the whole truth of God would sometimes be accused of being a hyper-Calvinist; and that the preacher who preached the whole truth of God would at other times be accused of being an out and out Arminian. And F. W. Robertson is but the type of a multitude of candid thinkers, when he tells us that he was in great trouble so long as he sought to discover the bond of connection between God's sovereignty and man's free-agency, and that he found rest only when he finally determined that both were true, and that he would preach them both, but that he would forever give over any attempt to understand or to explain the relation between them.

But Paul stands on a loftier height than either Cecil or Robertson. What to us seems contradiction, is to him as if it were not. He seems to discern the inner harmony between the divine and the human activities. He walks

with firm and elastic step along the edge of these fathomless abysses of thought, and, as for the depths of mystery, he does not even notice them. For my part I count it a proof of his inspiration. No merely human tongue could thus speak of the problem of the ages without effort to speculate or explain. I cannot understand Paul's calm declaration of the twofold truth without supposing that God lifted Paul up to something like his own divine point of view, and then enabled Paul to speak as the oracles of God.

While the ordinary reader of Scripture has contented himself with holding each of these truths alternately, the makers of theological systems have very often tried to do better, and to embrace both in a rightly proportioned and organic whole. But we have to confess that, owing to the limitations of the human intellect which I have already alluded to, whether these be original and permanent, or superinduced by sin and destined to gradual removal, the success of the systematizers has been far from complete. They have been constantly tempted to purchase a seeming unity by a partial ignoring of the one or the other element of the problem. Many a scheme of doctrine has been built up upon the single *datum* of human freedom. Freedom itself has been defined as the liberty of indifference, the soul's power to act without motive or contrary to the strongest motive, and such freedom has been declared to be the measure of obligation. The result has been the denial of all responsibility for our native depravity, all certainty of man's universal sinfulness and dependence upon Christ, all permanence of holy character in the redeemed or of unholy character in the lost, all predetermination or even foreknowledge by God of human free acts or final destinies — a self-dependent, self-righteous religion, in which the glory is given to man, not to God.

And then, on the other hand, many a system has been built upon the single *datum* of God's sovereignty, and man's freedom has been recognized only in name. Because God works all and in all, man's working has been ignored, and the human will has been made only the passive instrument of the divine efficiency and purpose. The result has been that human individuality has been lost sight of; the personality of man has been merged in the totality of the race; the race itself is but the automatic executor of an eternal decree; conscience is lulled to sleep; responsibility becomes a dream; sin is no longer guilt, but misfortune; men are saved or lost, no longer because of what they are or what they do, but only because it was so determined from eternity. A faith like this may have in it some grain of truth, and may be far better than no religion at all, but it is dangerously defective. It plays into the hands of modern materialism with its professedly scientific refutation of the freedom of the will; and if it cannot be justly called pantheistic, it is only because the necessitarian element in it is not carried to its logical consequences. Let it have its way unchecked and unchallenged, and Christianity becomes a dead orthodoxy, whose deadness is evinced by indolence and immorality of life.

Now it is this last error which in certain quarters is most prevalent, and which it is my present purpose to test by an appeal to Scripture and to consciousness. But before I do this, it is important to notice that, in the passage which I just now quoted, the apostle Paul does not urge human duty by denying or undervaluing the divine activity. He does not inculcate man's

work by disparaging God's. Nay, he not only recognizes both, but he bases the duty of the former upon the fact of the latter—"Work out your own salvation," he tells us, "for it is God that worketh in you." As between the Calvinistic and the Arminian scheme then, the Calvinistic is much the better, for it presents the more fundamental truth, the truth which human nature tends most to deny, the truth which we need most to recognize. An awe-inspiring view of God's working will nerve the soul, so that inaction will be impossible. It is not true, conversely, that a strong conviction of human power will lead to dependence upon God. The Scotch Covenanters knew what practical religion was. The English Church of the eighteenth century hardly did.

And the difference was determined largely by their creeds. To know tha God is at work in us gives hope and courage. All things are possible to himt who believes in this. But to be thrown back upon self and the strength of my unstable will for my security of salvation, this is weakening and depressing. Therefore Paul tells us that in our very working we are to recognize already the working of God and the pledge of victory. No synergism here; no recognition of an equal partnership between man and God, much less of a coöperation to be symbolized by a 'tandem' team in which man leads and God follows; nor a "working out," on man's part, of what God, on his part, "works in." All this misses the point entirely. Paul's idea is that God is in all, and man in all, so that man is to go forward joyfully, in the faith that every movement is the revelation of a divine energy within him, and that his success is not by might or power of his own, but by the Spirit of the Lord. Whatever stage of progress he shall reach, he shall know that in some true sense it is God who has wrought all his works in him, that unto these very works he has been created in Christ Jesus, according to the eternal ordination of God, and therefore he shall ever cry: "Not unto us, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory!"

Having thus vindicated my position as a genuine Calvinist, I wish to point out certain limitations of this doctrine of divine agency. And the first is that while God is said to be the worker of all good, he is not said to be the worker of all evil. There has been a hyper-Calvinism that has practically taught this. It has made God the only actor in the universe. Because all things are included in his plan, it has been supposed that he must work all by his actual efficiency. And when it has been objected that this must make God the direct author of sin in human hearts, and that the responsibility of sin is thus transferred from man to God, such men as Hopkins and Emmons have responded that the moral quality of action does not depend upon its cause, but only upon its nature.

It is difficult to find words strong enough to express the instinctive indignation of the unsophisticated mind at this slanderous imputation upon God, and at the perverse reasoning with which it is supported. Is it possible to suppose that a human being, created with a will set against holiness and efficiently caused to exercise his evil propensities, would still be responsible for the possession of this will and for the exercise of these propensities? Yet this must be true, if the moral quality of activity does not at all depend upon its cause. God might make a man evil; and yet for this evil, not God, but man, might be responsible. This cannot be. We can hold man respon-

sible for his evil nature, only upon the assumption that man is himself in some proper sense the originator of it. I do not now inquire whether there may not be a race-unity and a race-responsibility in virtue of which humanity is an organic whole, and constitutes one moral person before God. I only claim that no man's evil dispositions can be accounted guilty unless their origin can be traced back to some self-determined trangression, committed either in his individual capacity or in his connection with the race. We are guilty only of that sin which we have originated, or have had a part in originating. * Indeed there is no other sin than this. Sin is never God's work, but always man's. Within the bounds of the human race — and of this only we are speaking — sin is not caused by beings or by things outside of us. It is due, neither directly to God's efficiency, nor indirectly to the circumstances in which God has placed us. Man's sin comes from himself, and each man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own lust and enticed.

The view just combated, although it strenuously asserts the personality of God, is virtually a system of fatalism. Man's acts are all determined for him from without. Not only the natural power which is used in performing them, but their moral quality itself, is the result of God's efficient agency. Fortunately no extensive body of Christians has ever held this view. But there has been another view almost equally pernicious, and which still has great currency. It is the view that man's acts are all determined from within, so determined by his inborn tendencies and dispositions that his life is nothing but a necessary manifestation of inherited character. All action is simply an unfolding of the nature, and cannot be different from that nature in kind. Man's freedom is simply freedom to act conformably to his existing evil inclination. That inclination he has no power to modify or check. This view may be called determinism, as the former view was called fatalism. It grants a freedom *to* action, but denies a freedom *from* action. Man does as he pleases, but he cannot please differently. And yet, although the inborn tendencies determine the life by an absolute necessity, man is held responsible for his activities because they are determined not from without but from within.

Now before indicating the precise point of error in this view, let us test it by certain well known facts of our experience. The theory denies the existence of any power in man to check or to modify his prevailing inclination. The man's volitions must correspond with his evil nature. He has power to manifest his character in action, but he has no power to change his character. Is this true? The carnal mind is enmity to God. Must every man therefore commit the sin against the Holy Ghost? I do not ask whether the commission of this sin may not be expected in the case of every sinner who

---

* Some would prefer to add: "or with the origination of which we have had sympathy." But aside from the obvious objection that to be guilty of sympathizing with another's sin is not precisely to be guilty of committing that sin (the two are distinguished in Rom. 1: 32), I cannot think that this explanation of the common guilt of the race gives their full and natural meaning to phrases in Rom. 5: 12-19, such as "for that all sinned" (aorist, v. 12): "through one trespass" (v. 18). Compare 1 Cor. 15: 22; 2 Cor. 5: 14. The vast majority of men have never individually heard of Adam's sin; how then can they be said to sympathize with it? Is not this a sinning *like* Adam, instead of sinning *with* him; a fall through individual trespasses, rather than through the "one trespass" of the "one man?"

continues in wilful rebellion. I simply ask whether this sin against the Holy Ghost is to be expected, in the case of every sinner, at once, or at the beginning of his conscious transgression. You answer in the negative. You grant then that the sinner has power to avoid that sin — that in this case at least he has a freedom *from*, as well as a freedom *to*. Is this freedom wholly the result of special grace? Then if, apart from extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, this sin against the Holy Ghost would uniformly be committed at the first moment of moral consciousness, are not all moral conditions short of that sin solely due to God, and is not every man practically as guilty as if he had already committed it? But this seems clearly inconsistent with the special guilt attaching to its commission. Why is it that, unlike fallen angels, man has yet to commit a sin which will put him beyond the reach of mercy? We seem compelled to recognize here a remnant of freedom. Man is not borne on irresistibly by his evil nature, so that apart from the special power of God he must at once and inevitably commit the sin against the Holy Ghost.

Apply the principle still further. We must grant that even the unregenerate man has power to choose a less degree of sin instead of a greater; he can refuse altogether to yield to certain temptations; he can do outwardly good acts with imperfect motives; he can even seek God from considerations of self-interest. We do not claim that the unregenerate man can do any act, however insignificant, which can fully meet God's approval or answer the demands of his law. Much less do we claim that the unregenerate man can of himself change his fundamental preference for self and sin into a supreme love for God. But then, while we recognize inborn tendencies to evil and a bent of will contracted by persistent transgression, it is of great importance to remember that this is not the whole of the man. There is a residuum of power by which he may render himself more or less depraved. No man will be condemned in the final judgment solely because of what he was born with — judgment shall be rendered according to the deeds done in the body.

It is not true that the only probation is the probation of the race in Adam. There is an individual probation also, in which each man decides his destiny. Those who are shut out from God's mercy, at the last, will be shut out because they would not come to him that they might have life. Human existence in this world is not a mere spontaneous development of evil. As all men have freedom in thinking — as all men can suspend the action of mere association and can select the objects of their thought in matters that are merely secular — so, in matters of the soul, when God's claims are presented to the intellect, there is a power in every sinner to suspend present evil action and judgment and to fasten attention upon the considerations which urge obedience to God. If we say that in the absence of love for holiness there is no motive for even this slight and preliminary attention to the truth, I answer that there is still a natural propension toward abstract truth, besides the admonitions of conscience and the impulses of self-interest, which may be appealed to in the case of every sinner who has not yet sinned the sin unto death and said with Satan: "Evil, be thou my good!" And, that this natural self-interest is not in itself sinful, God himself shows when he addresses the warnings and invitations of his word both to men's hopes and to men's fears.

In the old Greek tragedy the Furies pursued men to wretched deaths, because these men had unwittingly committed some offense against divine or human law. Oedipus can say that his evil deeds have been suffered rather than done. But Christian ethics is obliged to found responsibility upon freedom. Somewhere we must find an originating act, which we either ourselves committed or in which we had a part. Somewhere we must find a point where we can say: It might have been otherwise. In everything which the conscience recognizes as sin, the plea of absolute necessity bars all guilt, remorse, or punishment. And here is the error of that form of Calvinism which it is my present object to criticize. It is the error of putting in the link of *necessity* between man's fundamental disposition and his individual choices. Volitions are conceived of as mere hands upon the dial, that indicate the internal structure of the clock. Will has no power to react upon the interior mechanism, and so change the direction or kind of its movement. Upon this view there should be no power of suspending evil action in any given case, no power of directing the attention to opposing considerations, no power of summoning up motives to good, no power of seeking help from God.

In this respect it seems to me that we are called upon to retreat from Jonathan Edward's philosophy to the positions of Scripture. Edwards held that volition must always follow inclination, and that an act of will contrary in its nature to the soul's fundamental preference was inconceivable and impossible. * But Adam was created in righteousness and true holiness — how was it possible that Adam could ever fall? The Christian's deepest love is love for God — how is it possible that the Christian can ever sin? Here are cases where the volitions are not mere manifestations of the soul's fundamental preference. How will Jonathan Edwards explain them? He does not pretend to explain them. You may look his works through, and find no solution of the problem. These are outlying facts which could not be reconciled with his theory of the will, and their existence proves his theory insufficient, however correct in its main features it may be.

Both Calvin and Augustine were broader than Edwards. They held that Adam at least had a power of contrary choice — not that he could choose good and choose evil at the same time, but that he had power to change his choice of good into a choice of evil — a power which he actually exercised in the fall. The race which fell in him has indeed lost the power to change its moral condition by an act of will, but its present state is referable to a free act in which, in the person of its first father, it consciously and wick-

* Edwards, it is true, calls this necessity a "philosophical necessity," and insists that he means by the phrase nothing more nor less than certainty (Freedom of the Will, p. 10). But there are passages in his treatise which imply much more than this. For example, he ascribes to future free acts the same necessity that belongs to an act done in the past (p. 77.) Motive is *cause*, and renders other volition than the one put forth causeless and impossible. Motive acts as inevitably as a mechanical cause, and volition is its effect, passively produced or modified (p. 53). "The will, at the time of that diverse or opposite leading act or inclination and when actually under the influence of it, is not able to exert itself to the contrary, to make an alteration in order to a compliance" — a sentence which is either meaningless, or means that a man cannot change any inclination or purpose which he has once formed.

edly apostatized from God. Calvin* and Augustine† both recognized, as Edwards never did, that, in spite of this transgression of the race in Adam and the inherited depravity that has resulted therefrom, each individual has a power of his own to check and to modify his evil nature and to make himself more or less guilty in the sight of God. Man is not wholly a development of inborn tendencies, a manifestation of original sin. The corrupt tree, says Augustine, may produce the wild fruit of morality, though it cannot produce the divine fruit of grace. There is still left a power to resist depravity and to attend to truth, just as the Christian man has still left a power to put forth evil volitions which contradict the governing disposition of his soul.

It is a great gain to doctrine and to conduct when we learn that character does not absolutely bind us. Christian character does not bind the Christian to be holy. Adam's and Satan's originally holy character did not absolutely bind them. They had power not only to choose ways of acting out their fundamental choice, but they had power of changing that choice. Not only had they power to choose between different expressions of motive, but they had power to choose between motives themselves. Both in the fall and at conversion there is such a new choice of motive. Motives are not properly causes, but only occasions, of our action. The man himself is the cause. Motives do not compel, they rather persuade, the will. The will acts in view of motives. And so we may give a new definition of free agency, considered as a condition of responsibility, and as distinguished from that spiritual freedom first-mentioned which is identical with perfect conformity to the divine law. Free agency — to give a formula which will apply to all responsible beings, perfect and imperfect, fallen and unfallen — is the soul's power to choose between motives, and to direct its subsequent activities according to the motive thus chosen.

In secular concerns, this choice between motives is no uncommon thing. We know what it is to choose a profession, and we know that this choice is a very different thing from the following of the profession thus chosen. In religious concerns this choice between motives is the event of a lifetime, whether it be the one decision for good in the life-time of the individual, or the one decision for evil in the life-time of the race. That decision once made, and the motive whether good or evil once chosen, affection and habit will make it harder and harder to change the decision and to reverse the

*Calvin, Inst. Rel. Ch., 1 : 15 : 8 — "Man was endowed with free will by which, if he had chosen, he might have obtained eternal life. Adam could have stood if he would, since he fell merely by his own will; but, because his will was flexible to either side and he was not endowed with constancy to persevere, therefore he so easily fell. Yet his choice of good and evil was free; and not only so, but his mind and will were possessed of consummate rectitude, and all his organic parts were rightly disposed to obedience, till destroying himself, he corrupted all his excellencies." * * * "It would have been unreasonable that God should be confined to this condition, to make man so as to be altogether incapable either of choosing or of committing any sin."

†Augustine, De Correptione et Gratia, c. 13 — "While all men are evil, they have through free will added [to original sin] some more, some less." De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, 2 : 1 — "Added to the sin of their birth sins of their own commission." 2 : 4 — "Neither denies our liberty of will whether to choose an evil or a good life, nor attributes to it so much power that it can avail anything without God's grace, or that it can change itself from evil to good."

choice. Evil doing will give rise to a diseased state in which the will is so weak that it is certain never to break its bonds without divine help. He that commits sin becomes the slave of sin, and will never emerge into freedom until Christ stretches out his hand to deliver. But even this certainty of continuous evil activity is not necessity; and the fact that this evil activity is self-originated and self-maintained is an all-sufficient ground of responsibility and condemnation both in conscience and before God's bar.

In Julius Müller's "Doctrine of Sin" there is frankly recognized, both in the individual and in the race as a whole, an already existing determination to evil. There is a bent of the will, prior to individual volitions, which cannot be explained as mere habit, and which amounts to an active preference of selfishness and sin. Thus far Julius Müller grants to determinism an element of truth. But then he declares that this existing determination to evil is partly limited by the will's remaining power of choice, and is partly traceable to a former self-determination. In my judgment the great German theologian has given us the best extant discussion of the subject, and with his conclusions, so far as man's present state is concerned, I substantially agree. I recognize such a thing as character — affections set in the direction of wrong or right, and endowed with power to persuade the will — and that with infallible certainty — because the will itself has made them what they are, and even now cherishes them. Even in the case of congenital bias toward evil we are responsible for the evil affections we inherit, because we are not simply individuals, but also members of a common humanity, which in its first father determined itself against God. But the complementary truth must never be forgotten, that these affections, formed as they are, are still subject in some degree to will, and that will is continually under the necessity either of resisting or of re-affirming them. The man's opportunity to choose between motives is a constant one, and whether he actually change his motive or not, he knows that he is not yet wholly deprived of his power to change it.

Of course the objection will be raised that this choice between motives must be a choice without motive, and that such an act of pure will is neither conceivable nor rational. We grant, with Calderwood, that an act of pure will is unknown in consciousness. There is no volition without motive, no putting forth of power without a reason for its exercise. We even dissent from Calderwood, when, very inconsistently with his statement already mentioned, he ascribes to will, in the initial act of attention, a freedom from the influence of motive. We maintain, on the contrary, that everywhere and always the will acts only in view of motives, and that the theory of liberty which represents will as existing in an undetermined state, or as determining itself without motive or against the strongest motive, is repugnant both to consciousness and to reason. The choice to attend to considerations prompting a different course from that which we are now pursuing, is never made but for a reason, and that reason may be found both in instincts from within and in incitements from without. Motives are commonly compounded of external presentations and of internal dispositions. In freely choosing between motives, the man is influenced by motives — by one motive more than by another; otherwise motives are a mere impertinence, and the man may make up his decision entirely without them. There can always be found

a reason for changing from one motive to another, aye, even in the case of capricious acts so-called, where the reason is simply the gratification of a lawless independence.

A reason, but not a cause. A persuasive influence, but not a constraining power. The cause, the power, are in the free will that chooses. That will infallibly chooses according to motive, but it is not determined by motive. Will is itself the determiner. Here is an act of absolute origination — an act inexplicable to the logical understanding. With Sir William Hamilton, we accept the fact that the will is an undetermined cause, upon the simple testimony of consciousness. But it may be questioned whether the whole difficulty in the case does not arise from taking the word motive in a mechanical sense, and from forgetting that the motive is nothing but the man. All motive is in the last analysis internal. Motive is simply the man in a certain state of feeling or desire. And will is nothing but this same man choosing.

The man may have many desires, and therefore many motives, some lower, some higher, but prior to his decision no one of these motives may be stronger than another. It is the soul's choosing to yield to the one rather than to the other that gives that one its strength. It becomes the prevailing motive only by the soul's determining to follow it and identify itself with it. As before choice it may be said that the motive was only the man, so after choice it may be said that the man is nothing but his motive — at least until at some new epoch of his experience, he gives himself up to some new impulse that clamors for control. So man is not a creative first cause, for the reason that he only chooses between impulses previously existing — a drop of water, as a French writer has said, which chooses whether it will flow into the Rhine or into the Rhone. The forces that bear it onward are not of its own making, any more than the drop of water makes the force of gravitation. Man can choose his direction only, whether toward holiness or unholiness, Satan or God, heaven or hell. Yet, determining what his motive shall be, he determines his character, that is, he determines himself: he is in the highest sense self-determined, and therefore solely responsible, not only for his present character, but for all the executive acts which flow therefrom.*

Man is one, and desire and will always go together. They act and react upon each other. The will may strengthen or weaken the desires by directing the attention to or from the objects adapted to excite them. Man may thus to a certain extent change his course and modify his character. The

*Since writing the above I find in the Princeton Review for 1856, pp. 514, 515, an extended notice of William Lyall's *Intellect, Emotions and Moral Nature* (Edinburgh, Constable & Co., 1855). From that work the following lines are quoted with approval: "The will follows reasons, inducements, but it is not *caused*. It obeys, or it acts under inducement, but it does so sovereignly." .... "It exhibits the phenomena of activity in relation to the very motive it obeys. It obeys it rather than another. It determines in reference to it that this is the very motive which it will obey. There is undoubtedly this phenomenon exhibited, the will obeying, but elective, active in its obedience. If it be asked how this is possible, how the will can be under the influence of motive and yet possess an intellectual activity, we reply that this is one of those ultimate phenomena which must be admitted, while they cannot be explained." So we may add that in all fundamental choices the object chosen and the motive for choosing are one and the same thing.

desires in turn act upon the will and influence its decisions, without however destroying its power to accept or reject their suggestions. Which comes first, desire or will? It is like asking: "Which comes first, strength or exercise? In this last case, we should answer: Either may come first. Strength usually comes first, and is the condition of exercise. But there are cases when strength is greatly reduced, and only exercise will restore it. Then exercise comes before strength. So, in the case of our ordinary action, desire seems to precede will; in the crises of our history, will seems to precede desire.

In the cognition of beauty, who can tell which goes before, the intellectual apprehension or the state of the sensibility? Do you say the man must first know, in order to feel? Chronologically, yes — for his feeling must have an object, and this the intellect must furnish. Logically, no — for no man can see a beauty which he does not love; and the taste conditions the intellectual apprehension. So both desire and will are involved in every moral act; each affects the other. Yet in certain acts the one element may be more prominent than the other, the one may precede the other. Logically, desire may come first; but chronologically, will.

The views presented in this paper are partly intended to constitute a supplement and modification of those advocated by the author in the article which precedes this. That there may be no mistake with regard to their nature, let me here sum up what has been said thus far, and distinguish my position as precisely as possible from other schemes with which it might be confounded. *As to original sin.* The race is organically one. When Adam sinned and fell, all there was of human nature sinned and fell in him. By an act of free will he corrupted his nature, and all his posterity possess by inheritance that nature which corrupted itself in him. Adam's act of will was an act of permanent choice, and we partake of it. The result of that act was a depraving of his affections, and we partake of them. I reject however that division of the human powers which classes affections under the head of will. I would speak of voluntary affections only in the sense that the will has originated, and that the will continues to cherish, these affections. Both in the case of Adam and in the case of his posterity, the settled choice of self as the end of living, and the evil affections which result therefrom, involve a moral inability to do right or to obey God, while yet the natural ability remains. Man can change his evil desire, but he has no desire to change. The can-not is simply a will-not; though, until the Spirit of God deliver him, that will-not is a bondage as terrible and remorseless as any imprisonment behind iron bars. But it is a bondage for which the sinner is responsible and guilty, because it consists in nothing but his own active choice of evil.

Not all sin then is personal. There was a first race-sin, in which man's will and affections freely and wickedly contracted a perverse bent and inclination. Only by identifying ourselves with Adam, can we account for our birth with evil dispositions for which both conscience and Scripture hold us guilty. But now, *as to man's remaining freedom.* Neither Adam nor his posterity in that first act of sin lost their natural power of will, though they did lose their inclination to will conformably to God's law. There was still in the case of Adam — there is still in the case of his posterity — a power to

check the manifestations of evil inclination, and at least indirectly and with imperfect motives to seek its reversal. It is within man's power to be more or less corrupt in his outward life, and to use with more or less faithfulness the outward means of grace. Inborn character does not so bind a man that he has no individual probation. He has still the freedom which consists in choosing between motives; and inasmuch as this choice is not without motive but is made for a reason, there is previous certainty of an evil choice, while yet the soul has perfect power to make a right one. Thus I would exclude both the hyper-Calvinistic determinism which would make the life of each individual simply the evolution of his inherited depravity, and also the Arminian theory of the uncertainty of human action which would make it impossible for God either to foreordain or to foreknow the future.

Although the Scriptures teach that God only can give the new heart, sinners are exhorted in Scripture to make to themselves a new heart. Regeneration is plainly not a mechanical work of God, but a work of personal influence upon the sinner's affections. Nor is it an influence exerted only through the truth, as if man were the only agent, and moral suasion were the only method God could employ to change man's will. We repel the notion that the only communication between spirit and spirit is through truth; for this is a virtual denial of the Christian's union with Christ and of God's personal communion with the human soul. We know of an influence exerted by the orator, which is above and beyond that of the words he speaks. We know of a power of personal influence, that passes that of argument. There is a subtle magnetism in the presence of a noble friend, that disarms objection and opens the heart to his persuasions ere we are aware. There is an atmosphere of purity and truth and love enwrapping some devoted souls, that draws us to them and makes us trust everything they say. Aye, there seem to be subtle laws, only obscurely understood as yet, in accordance with which soul comes into contact with soul, and acts directly upon soul, though sundered far by space, and deprived of all physical intermediaries. So Christ's entrance into the soul and joining himself to it has power to change the heart. The renewing Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, and in that new contact of the human spirit with the divine, the soul is transformed into the image of him who first created it.

But this personal presence of Christ does not constrain or compel. Rather is there a new consciousness of strength and a new sense of freedom. Lifted up into this new divine companionship, and penetrated with this new divine life, there is a soul-absorbing penitence for sin and submission to the Savior. God's working in the soul to will and to do, has for its result and accompaniment the soul's working-out of its own salvation. The great change which, looked at from the divine side, we call regeneration, when looked at from the human side, may be called conversion. Regeneration has logical, but not chronological, precedence of conversion. Man turns only as God turns him, indeed; but it is equally true that man is never to wait for God's working. If he is ever regenerated, it must be in and through a movement of his own will, in which he turns to God as unconstrainedly, and with as little consciousness of God's operation upon him, as if no such operation of God were involved in the change. And, in preaching, we are to press upon men the claims of God and their duty of immediate submission

to Christ, with the certainty that they who do so submit will subsequently recognize this new and holy activity of their own wills as due to the working within them of divine power.

So we come back at last to the point from which we set out. The freedom which consists in the power to choose between motives is to be so used under grace that we may through it enter into that higher freedom which consists in the glad surrender of all our powers to God. In the fall man lost the latter, while he retained the former. Only the grace of God can restore that harmony of the human will with the law of holiness, for which man was originally made. *Formal* freedom, as the Germans call the mere power to put forth single volitions externally conformed to law, is not enough. Man needs *real* freedom, by which phrase those same Germans designate the power to love God with all the heart, and so, to live according to the idea of man's being. This real freedom, this freedom in the highest sense, is partially restored in regeneration; it will be perfectly restored when we awake in Christ's likeness. In the case of the saints in heaven, the formal freedom will be merged in the real and will be made the organ for its manifestation, as it is in the case of God himself, and they shall be perfect even as their Father in heaven is perfect. The highest freedom involves a certainty of holy character and of holy action, for it is a state in which mind and heart and will, all the outgoing powers and all the inner being, are set, without the shadow of a fear or the chance of wavering, in one pure and everlasting fixedness of devotion to duty and of likeness to God.

And so, faith leads to freedom. The soul at one with God and inspired by God becomes a centre of force in the universe, an originator and communicator of holy influence in the highest sense in which this is possible to the creature. In becoming the servants of Christ we become the Lord's freemen, for only he whom the Son makes free is free indeed. But another use of our formal freedom is possible. We may use it to rivet yet more tightly the manacles of sense and sin, so that escape, from being difficult, becomes hopeless. We may make ourselves the slaves of selfishness, the sport of passion, mere waifs upon the roaring sea of circumstance, mere passive and brute tools of the evil one. Now for a time there is possible a turning of the thoughts to God and to the motives for repentance. But the day will come when character will become indurated, when self-interest will be of less account than hatred to God, when there will be no motives longer to which even God can appeal in order to save. So the soul, which was meant to have a potency second only to God's, becomes impotent. In losing God it has lost itself. It has used its remainder of freedom only to reiterate and confirm the first evil choice of humanity and to put real freedom permanently beyond its reach. While the righteous reign with God, true lords and free, the ungodly are not so, but are like the chaff which the wind driveth away, helpless, worthless, outcast forever.

The current tendency to believe in a probation after death must be considered as a historical judgment upon the erroneous postulates of the so-called New England Theology. That theology is in its innermost principle atomistic. The race is nothing — the individual is all. Since there is no race-responsibility and no common guilt, a fair probation in the next world is demanded in the case of those who have had no individual or proper proba-

tion in this.* This method of reasoning cannot be met except by reaffirming the old truth which the New England theology has denied, namely that of a fair probation of the whole race in Adam, and the universal guilt and condemnation of mankind on account of its common fall in him. Whatever comes to us in the way of opportunity and privilege since that first sin, is of grace, not of debt. Our individual probation gives us *more* than a fair chance. And since no man has a right to demand this *new* chance at the hands of God, it is optional with God to how many it shall be extended, and how long it shall continue. As he has provided the redemption, it is for him to settle its terms. Scripture alone can determine when the day of grace shall end. And while Scripture seems to intimate that in the judgment none shall be condemned solely on account of the common sin of the race in Adam and that the grace of Christ shall avail to the salvation of all who have not consciously and personally transgressed, it seems to declare with equal plainness that the present is the last scene of probation, that there is a law written on the heart by which all men shall be tried, that even the heathen are without excuse, and that after the opportunities of this mortal state are over, there is a departure of each soul to its own place, whether that be one of sin or holiness, of happiness or misery. Here there are motives presented on either side, and every man has power either to resist the evil and guilty tendencies of the nature, with the certainty that such struggle will be aided and blessed of God, or to confirm the sinful affections, so that no influences which God can consistently use will avail to save. And the decisions of this life are final. Will is not independent of motive, and all motives to good must be furnished by God. The wicked are indeed in the next world subjected to suffering. But suffering has in itself no reforming power. Unless accompanied by special renewing influences of the Spirit of God it only hardens and embitters the soul. We have no Scripture evidence that such influences of the Spirit are exerted after death upon the still impenitent, but abundant evidence, on the contrary, that the moral condition in which death finds men, is their condition forever. After death, comes, not probation, but judgment, and there is a great gulf fixed between the righteous and the wicked, which finite spirits cannot pass, and which the grace of God will not.

This then is the new Calvinism which I would advocate. It holds just as strongly as the old to God's initiative and to God's sovereignty in regeneration. God does not give the same influences to all, nor to any, all the influences which in his abstract omnipotence he can. There are influences

* Dr. G. H. Emerson, a leading Universalist, in his "Doctrine of Probation Examined" points out very forcibly this tendency of the New England theology. "The truth," he says, "at once of ethics and of Scripture, that sin is in its permanent essence a free choice, however for a time it may be held in mechanical combination with the notion of moral opportunity arbitrarily closed, can never mingle with it, and must in the logical outcome permanently cast it off." Dr. Newman Smyth, in his introduction to Dorner's Eschatology, suggests that we must either, with Julius Müller, find a fair probation in a pre-existent state, or else, with Dorner, grant one after death. Neither Dr. Emerson nor Dr. Smyth could reach their conclusions, of Universalism and of future probation respectively, if they seriously held to the oneness of the race and its common fall in Adam. The doctrine of a fair probation of mankind at the beginning is needed to prevent the inference that there must be a further probation, if not universal salvation, in the world to come.

of his Spirit which may be resisted. There are other influences which are sufficient to secure acceptance of Christ, when without them men would persevere in iniquity and be lost. God is not under bonds to give any of these to sinners, nor will he give them, after the short summer of this life is past. When he does give them in any degree, resistance on the part of the sinner involves a new guilt and condemnation. They will become effectual to no man's salvation, unless that man freely yield to the divine persuasion and choose for his supreme motive the love of God. We have emphasized hitherto the divine element in this great fundamental change. Let us not leave men in ignorance of the human element which the Scriptures connect inseparably with it. We have taught that God works in us to will and to do of his good pleasure. Let us teach also that men must work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. Only thus will the Christian learn that he must by perseverance prove his faith to be true. Only thus will the sinner learn that the whole guilt of his soul's destruction will rest upon himself. For both the Christian and the sinner are exhorted to work, to strive, to seek. We are responsible not only for all we can do ourselves, but for all we can secure from God. God's work and man's work form one whole. To ignore God's work is to destroy our hope. To ignore man's work is to destroy our responsibility. What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

IX.

THE CHRISTIAN MIRACLES,

OR, MIRACLES AS ATTESTING A DIVINE REVELATION.*

The Christian religion claims the acceptance and obedience of all men upon the ground that it is a system of truth and duty revealed by God. It professes to give evidence that it is from God. It points to its internal characteristics as proof that it has come from God's wisdom; it points to its external accompaniments as proof that it has come from God's power. By its internal characteristics we mean a supernatural adaptation to human wants, as attested by those who have really received it. By its external accompaniments, we mean a series of supernatural events attending its original publication, such as only God could work, and such as leave no reasonable doubt that the Author of nature is also the Author of the scheme of doctrine promulgated in his name.

Among Christian apologists of the last quarter-century, there has been a tendency to lay the stress of argument upon the internal evidences. Much has been done to show the supernatural character of the Scripture teaching. The unity of revelation, the superiority of the New Testament system of morality, the conception of Christ's person and character presented there, the witness of Jesus to his own divinity and lordship, have all been adduced as proving its divine origin. But while we gratefully accept the results of these recent studies of the book itself, we must still record our belief that the internal evidence of Christianity is necessarily secondary and supplementary. Of itself and by itself, it is insufficient to substantiate the divine authority of the Christian system.

For in the Christian system we include more than the New Testament morality; we include all that teaching with regard to the divine nature and methods of dealing, in view of which we speak of Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, Regeneration, Judgment, Immortality. Internal evidence might possibly suffice to secure acceptance of the Christian morality, for reason can recognize its sublime elevation; but the doctrines which chiefly make the Bible what it is — a revelation of supernatural and saving truth — are all beyond the power of reason to discover, or even to demonstrate, after they have been made known. "Of what use," says Lessing, "would be a revelation that revealed nothing?" But if the Scriptures be in any proper sense a revelation, an unveiling of truth, which is above and beyond our natural powers, it is necessary that they be accompanied by some external proof

* An Essay read before the Baptist Pastors' Conference of the State of New York, Binghamton, Oct. 23, 1878, and printed in the Baptist Review, April, 1879.

that they are from God; else the very greatness of the truth may only perplex and affront us.

It has been suggested, indeed, that God's testimony to the truth of a revelation might be given not externally, but internally, by direct action of his spirit upon the mind, and that for this reason any external certification by miracles must be regarded as unnecessary. But can we be sure that the method of internal certification is the preferable one? It labors under certain manifest disadvantages. It cannot in the nature of the case furnish so clear an evidence of its divine authorship. Being internal, how can it be known that it comes from a God external to the soul? What is needed is absolute certainty on the part of the recipient that the communication is from such a God, and that the truth communicated is not subjective, but independent of the mind's consciousness of it. But it is essential to inward communications that to the person receiving them they appear, at least in the beginning, as original discoveries of his own. Only by reflection can it be determined that they come from without, not from within, and, in the case of doctrines or commands that stagger the reason, some other assurance than mere logic can give is absolutely needed to convince the recipient that these seeming communications from God are not the vagaries of his own brain. Thus we very naturally find Gideon begging for an outward sign that he is not self-deceived. Even in the case of the original recipient of a revelation, outward certification seems to confer an important advantage. But what is an advantage to the person to whom the revelation is first communicated, is an absolute necessity to the multitude to whom he proclaims his message. If his possession of new ideas of doctrine and duty is not proof even to himself that these ideas are true, much less is it proof to others. Without some external sign that God has sent him, his mere declaration of the fact is utterly untrustworthy. As a communicator of new truth, of which reason is incompetent to judge, he needs and he must have divine credentials before his word can bind the moral action of men. Is it said that God can make the same revelation at the same moment inwardly to the mind of each separate individual of the race? Granting this to be true, as an abstract proposition, is it not manifest that the methods of God's working are actually different from this? Great secular truths are first made the possession of some favored nation, and of some favored individual in that nation, in order that through the individual they may be imparted to the nation, and through the nation to mankind. So we may expect religious truths to be directly communicated by God, not to all, but to single members of the race, and then indirectly through their voice and testimony to the world. There is economy in the use of natural force; shall there not be also economy of the supernatural? Shall we have exertions of supernatural power by the thousand million, in the internal life of all of earth's inhabitants, in order to communicate the divine ideas? And then, shall these be supplemented by miracles wrought in the case of each, to convince each that the original communication is from God? Surely in place of a scheme of internal certification which requires for its execution such a multitude of supernatural acts, we may well prefer the plan of external certification which requires but few. If one act of divine certification will answer the purpose, we may believe that God will not employ a million. But a million are needed if internal evidence alone

is admissible, while upon a plan which admits external evidence, we need but a single one. In condescension to human weakness, God may give us more, yet it still remains true that a single miracle like that of Christ's resurrection may substantiate the divine authority of all his claims and teachings, and bear upon its Atlantean shoulders the weight of Christianity itself.

Nor is the defense of the Christian miracles an optional matter with those who accept the internal evidences. For the internal and the external are so inextricably interwoven, that loss of faith in the one involves loss of faith in the other. However impressive the doctrine of Scripture may be, if it be accompanied by falsehood in matters of fact, it is proved thereby to have not a divine but a human origin. But facts are not merely accompaniments here — they are the centre and core of its teaching. Its main doctrines claim to be facts as well as doctrines, and to be doctrines only because they are facts. The incarnation and resurrection of Jesus Christ are valuable for purposes of doctrine, only as they are first allowed to be facts of history. But such facts as these are miracles. And therefore Christianity stands or falls with its miracles. As a scheme of faith and a method of salvation it has no claim upon us, unless the supernatural facts which constitute its essence, and by which it declares itself attested, were historical realities. If Jesus did not take human flesh in other than the common method of natural generation, if he did not do works beyond all human or natural powers to accomplish, above all, if he did not rise from the dead, he is a proved impostor, his claim to be a teacher commissioned by God is falsified, and Christianity, as a system divinely authoritative and obligatory, exists no longer.

While we urge, however, the primary importance of these external evidences of our religion, we would never sunder them from the internal. There is something of truth in the maxim of Pascal, that the miracles prove the doctrine and the doctrine proves the miracles. The two go together. Miracles do not stand alone as evidences. Power alone cannot prove a divine commission. Purity of life and doctrine must go with the miracles to assure us that a religious teacher has come from God. The miracles and the doctrine mutually supplement each other and form parts of one whole. The absence of either would throw suspicion upon the teacher who failed to produce it. In the case of apparently supernatural works wrought by a teacher of flagrant immorality, any explanation would be preferable to holding that they were wrought by God. We are even willing to grant that over certain minds and certain ages the internal evidence may have greater power than the external. It is probable that men in the present generation are more frequently led from faith in the transforming efficacy of the Christian religion to faith in its outward facts, than through the reverse process. Still we must not be blinded to the fact that the order of chronological apprehension is not necessarily the order of logical connection and dependence. The internal evidences have power to convince, only because the external facts are assumed to be worthy of confidence; they lose all independent value so soon as the external facts are found to be without historical foundation. While therefore we claim other evidence than that of miracles, we hold that this is logically the prior and the more important. It has been well said that a supernatural fact is the proper proof of a supernatural doctrine, but a supernatural doctrine is not the proper proof of a supernatural fact.

Nor do we, with these explanations, regard the Christian miracles as a burden rather than a support. To the beginner in geometry the first proposition is a burden until he has mastered it; then it becomes the firm basis and foundation of the second. So we hold that the possibility and probability of miracles may be proved to the candid mind, and that the Christian miracles may be shown to be not incredible, but on the other hand to rest upon evidence sufficient to warrant rational conviction of their historical reality. So much having been done, the miracles will take their place as solid substructions of the edifice of doctrine; we shall walk the upper floors with confidence because we know the foundation is secure. We are persuaded that the very prevalent suspicion of the miraculous which so frequently prevents the acceptance of Christianity and prejudices even the examination of its records, ought to vanish before a reconsideration and restatement of the doctrine of miracles. That miracles have been in the least discredited is doubtless due in some degree to the partial view of the universe which modern physical science has given us. But other science has made progress likewise. The sciences of mind and of morals have right to be heard also. We are persuaded that one who embraces these as well as the science of matter in his scheme of knowledge, and who regards nature and the supernatural together as constituting the one system of God, ought to find no serious difficulty, either intellectual or practical, in the acceptance of the Christian miracles.

But, not to anticipate, let us define at once what we mean by a miracle. We mean an event in nature, so extraordinary in itself, and so coinciding with the prophecy or command of a religious teacher or leader, as fully to warrant the conviction on the part of those who witness it that God has wrought it with the design of certifying that this teacher or leader is commissioned by him. Here are several elements, which, for the sake of distinctness, it may be well to state separately. A miracle, then, is an event in nature. By nature we mean what is not God and what is not made in the image of God — in other words, the physical world. The realm of mind and will, inasmuch as this is free and not embraced in the chain of physical causation, is not a part of nature, but belongs to the supernatural. Regeneration, therefore, as a spiritual work of God, does not occur in the realm of nature, and is not a miracle. A miracle is an event that can be witnessed. There is something in it that is palpable to the senses. In the restoration of sight to the blind, though the method of the wonder is not manifest, the change from blindness to sight is visible. In resurrection of the dead, although the reëntrance of the spirit into its mortal tenement is not matter of observation, the fact that the man was dead, and that now he lives again, is patent to all. But creation is not a miracle, because, among other reasons, there was no eye to witness it.

Again, the miracle is an extraordinary event in nature. It cannot be explained as part of a series of regularly recurring sequences. It falls under no law of nature in the sense of being referable to any order of known facts. It is exceptional, unique. If there be any law that regulates its occurrence, it is not a law which otherwise manifests itself in the present system of the physical universe. And yet the apparent want of connection with the present physical order is not so remarkable as the actual connection with another

and higher domain — that of intelligence and will. For the mere description of the unique physical event does not complete the account of the miracle, else the falling of a meteoric stone might be a miracle. The miracle is a combination of two things — an extraordinary occurrence in nature, and the coinciding prophecy or command of a religious teacher.

Still further, in the case of the miracle, the extraordinariness of the event and the prediction or command of the messenger are so connected, that our intuition of design leaves us no alternative but to infer that God is the author of the coincidence, and that, with the purpose of giving evidence that the messenger has been sent by him. Here we see the difference between miracle and special providence. In the latter the connection of the event with the religious purpose to be served thereby is not so close as to render an opposite explanation impossible. *Some* warrant is furnished for believing it designed for a particular religious end, but not what may be called *full* warrant. With the miracle it is otherwise. When Christ appeals to his works as evidences that the Father has sent him, and declares that, in still further testimony to this fact, he will rise from the dead on the third day, the believer in his resurrection must also be a believer in his commission from God, or else hold that God could and did work a miracle in support of falsehood. So inevitable is such a conclusion, that we find even Spinoza declaring that he would break his system in pieces and embrace without reluctance the ordinary faith of Christians, if he could once be persuaded of the resurrection of Lazarus from the dead.

It will be observed that in our definition we take no ground with regard to that much disputed question whether the miracle be a suspension or violation of natural law, nor with regard to that other question as vigorously pressed of late, whether the miracle absolutely dispenses with all physical means and antecedents, and is the result simply of an immediate volition of God. It is our belief that the Christian miracles might be successfully defended, even if both these questions were answered in the affirmative. But on the other hand, it is our belief also, that Christian apologists have here allowed themselves too frequently to fight their battle upon ground chosen by their enemies. It was Hume who first stigmatized the miracle as a violation or suspension of natural law, and the transgression of the order which God had himself appointed was declared to be the greatest of absurdities and enormities. But Scripture gives no sign that the miracle is thus conceived of by those who wrote it, nor is there the slightest necessity that we should accept Hume's assumption as to the method in which God must work, if he work at all. Again, it is too often taken for granted that miracle is equivalent to divine fiat, reaching its goal with absolute exclusion of natural means. But Scripture compels us to no such view. On the other hand it points to the East wind as the means by which the Red Sea was parted at the Exodus and leaves it not improbable that the sinking of a considerable area in Western Asia was the physical cause of the deluge, and a simoom of the desert the physical cause of the destruction of the host of Sennacherib. What was God's method here — what was his method in the working of any particular miracle, we do not know. We would have it distinctly understood that we do not have and that we do not think it necessary to have, any particular theory as to the method of them. But when the

opponents of the Christian miracles first identify our doctrine with their preconceived notions of it, and then triumph because they have, in their own estimation, proved those notions to be absurd, it is time for us to show that other conceptions are at least possible.

Miracles, we claim, may be wrought by God, while yet no physical law is suspended or violated. To sustain this proposition it is only necessary to refer to facts within the range of our common experience. We know that lower forces and laws in nature are counteracted and transcended by the higher, while yet these lower forces and laws are not suspended or annihilated, but are merged in the higher and made to assist in accomplishing results to which they are altogether unequal when left to themselves. Imagine, for example, that no forces or laws were in operation except the purely mechanical ones, such as gravitation and cohesion. In such a merely mechanical creation, let the reaction of carbonate of lime and sulphuric acid for the first time occur. Here is disintegration and effervescence, such as no merely mechanical law can explain. And why? Because a new force of a higher sort has begun to act, namely, a chemical force. This accomplishes what gravitation and cohesion never could. It counteracts these tendencies to knit together, while it transcends them. But no one will maintain that the laws of gravitation and cohesion are annihilated or suspended or violated in the least degree. They are still active and operative, and influence to a considerable extent the disposition of the material particles under the action of the higher force. And yet, to the merely mechanical creation, this same reaction of carbonate of lime and sulphuric acid is a chemical miracle.

Again, imagine a world where as yet no forces or laws exist except the mechanical and chemical. In such a world let a seed-corn be planted and begin to grow. Here is a new force that abstracts from the soil and bears aloft to every portion of the organism the moisture and nutriment suited to its needs. Mechanical laws, such as gravitation and cohesion, may say nay; but they are obliged to yield, and even to help the growing structure and make it strong. Here is a new force that conquers chemistry also, and presses it into service; for every leaf performs the wonderful feat which man accomplishes only with long art and imposing mechanism—the feat of decomposing carbonic acid, taking the carbon for food and throwing the oxygen away — yet performs it so quietly that the leaf is not even stirred by the process. To the merely mechanical and chemical creation this vegetable transformation is a vital miracle. The new force does what gravitation and chemistry never could, to the end of time. But is any mechanical or chemical law annihilated, suspended, or violated? By no means. Both sorts of law are operative all the time. Partly because they are operative, does the plant preserve its balance, maintain its strength, secure its proper sustenance.

These are instances drawn from nature only. But we know equally well that an event in nature may be caused by an agent outside of and above nature. The human will can act upon nature and can produce results which nature left to herself never could accomplish, while yet no law of nature is suspended or violated. To put this in a clear light, let me remind you of the German philosopher Fichte's illustration of the unchangeableness of natural sequences. He bids us imagine a pebble swept on to a high place upon the beach, by the strongest wave of a stormy day, and then speculates

upon the changes in nature which would have been requisite to land the pebble one foot further upon the sand. The wave must have been of greater volume, the wind that drove it of greater force. The preceding state of the atmosphere by which the wind was occasioned, and its degree of strength determined, must have been different from what it actually was, and the previous changes which gave rise to this particular weather must have been different also. We must suppose a different temperature from that which actually existed, and a different constitution of the bodies which influenced that temperature, not only in distant Africa where the wind took its rise, but in every other country of the globe. In short, the philosopher must suppose a different make-up of the whole system of things from the beginning, in order that a single pebble might lie in a different place. So he argues the impossibility of any modification in the existing condition of material agents, unless through the invariable operation of a series of eternally impressed consequences following in some necessary chain of orderly connection.

But Mansel suggests the answer to Fichte. The answer is as follows: Let us make one alteration in the circumstances supposed. Let us imagine that, after the winds and waves have done their utmost, I go down to the beach, and, lifting the pebble from its place, I deposit it a foot further up upon the sand. Is the student of physical science prepared to enumerate a similar chain of material antecedents which must have been other than they were, before I could have chosen to deposit the pebble on any other spot than that on which it is now lying? In other words, is human thought and will determined in its sequences and conclusions by natural laws? No one except the fatalist will say this. We know, on the contrary, that while nature's laws are rigid, there is a power superior to these laws, and exempt from their control, namely, the power of the personal will, and that in the will of man we have an instance of an efficient cause in the highest sense of that term, acting among and along with the physical causes of the material world, and producing results which would not have been brought about by any invariable sequence of physical causes left to their own action. We have evidence, in fine, of an elasticity in the constitution of nature, which permits the influence of human power on the phenomena of the world to be exercised or suspended at will, without affecting in the least the stability of the great system of things. If I throw a stone into the air, its *fall* is determined by natural laws, but can any man say that my *throwing* it was the mere result of natural laws? Nay, my free will — something above nature — has done it, nor has any law of nature been violated thereby.

An additional illustration will enable us to apply this principle to the subject in hand. Suppose I stand by the side of a swiftly running stream and hold a heavy piece of iron upon my flat, extended palm, in such a way that my hand is submerged and the top of the iron is just visible above the surface of the water. Why does not the iron sink? Because my hand is underneath it. Is the law of gravitation suspended? No, nothing but the axe is suspended. How do I know that gravitation still operates? Because the axe has weight. I hold it steadily in its place only by effort. If gravitation were not acting, the axe would be swept away like a straw by the rapid current. I have counteracted the working of gravitation; I have pressed it

into my service, and compelled it to do what left to itself it never would, namely, keep a piece of iron immovable at the surface of the water; I have transcended the powers of natural law by bringing in a new force, namely, the force of my own personal will. From the point of view of mere physical nature, here is a miracle of will. Yet no law of nature is annihilated, suspended, or violated. And now, if man can do as much as this, cannot God do the same, and, by putting his hand beneath the iron, make the axe to swim at the prophet's word?

But it is urged that the analogy is far from complete, for the reason that man's body at least is a part of nature, and that here is a use of means. The hand is put underneath the axe. But God has no hands. We reply that before man puts his hand under the axe, he must *move* his hand. And in moving his hand, his will comes directly in contact with his own physical organism. We do not know *how* spirit operates upon matter, but we do know that in the human body this operation is a *fact*. Every time I lift my arm, I know that I rule matter and compel it to serve me. I do this freely, and no law is violated or suspended therein. With this constant proof before me, that spirit can act directly upon matter, I must surely believe that the Spirit that is everywhere present can act directly upon matter. And this we can maintain without holding that God is confined to the universe, and finds in it his sensorium; that he is in nature does not prove that he is not also above nature. What the human will, considered as a supernatural force, and what the chemical and vital forces of nature itself, are demonstrably able to accomplish, cannot be regarded as beyond the power of God, so long as God dwells in and controls the universe. In other words, if a God be possible, then miracles are possible. The same God who created the second causes that exist in nature, can supplement their action when it pleases him. It is no more impossible for him to multiply the five loaves so that they feed five thousand, than to multiply the handful of wheat in the earth so that it produces the harvest. He who provides remedial agents for the diseases of the body, can dispense with these agents, and can heal diseases by his word. He who gives life at the beginning, can say: "Lazarus, come forth!" Being more directly in contact with nature than is the human will with its physical organism, he can produce new results in nature. The impossibility of the miracle can be maintained only upon principles either of Atheism or of Pantheism—either upon the ground that there is no God, or that there is no God except the God that is immanent in nature, a God without consciousness, freedom, or holiness, a God identical with the universe itself.

A second question was proposed, this namely: Does the miracle, so far as it is a merely physical fact, necessarily involve an immediate volition of God at the time of its occurrence? It has been intimated that there are certain of the extraordinary events of Scripture which seem capable of explanation without this hypothesis. The wonders of the Red Sea, of the deluge, of Sennacherib's destruction, were such. If these were miracles, the immediate act of God may have been simply the communication to the prophet of such knowledge of the event, that he was enabled to foretell or command in virtue of that communication. Archbishop Trench has proposed to set such instances as these by themselves and call them "providential miracles," thus intimating that the wonder of them consisted, not in immediate intervention

or change in the order of nature, but in the providential arrangement of the event and of the prophecy, so that they coincided with one another, and together gave evidence of the divine commission of the prophet who foretold or commanded them. The outward event may be part of a chain of physical antecedents and consequents, the remarkable and exceptional result of merely natural causes, yet in its connection with the prophetic word it may be a visible token from God. Let us again remind ourselves of the definition of a miracle. A miracle is not simply an extraordinary physical event, but an extraordinary physical event in peculiar connection with the word of a religious teacher or leader. Even if we should grant, therefore, that no divine volition goes to the production of the physical event except what goes to the production of any other event in nature, still we need not deny the direct agency of God in the prophetic announcement with which this event was accompanied. The immediate volition would simply be relegated to the mental and spiritual world and find its sphere of working there. Even if all miracles should be explained in this way, we should not lose the evidence of the divine presence and working in the miracle as a whole. The prophet's knowledge would prove God to be with him, and would completely substantiate his claims.

This theory of the miracle was broached by Babbage, in his celebrated Bridgewater Treatise. Babbage, it will be remembered, was the inventor of the great calculating machine to whose construction Parliament made so large appropriations. In his treatise, he illustrates his view of the miracle by the working of his arithmetical engine. It was so constructed that upon setting it in motion, the regular series of whole numbers presented themselves at an aperture in the front of the machine,— one, two, three, four, and so on to ten, eleven, twelve, each successive number consisting of the last preceding with the addition of a single unit, till the hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions were reached.— After observing this uniform sequence for days and weeks together, the spectator might not unnaturally conclude that succession by regular additions of one was the law of the machine. But lo ! after the number ten million is reached, there is a sudden leap. We have not ten million and one, but 100,000,000, and thereafter the machine reverts to its former law of succession. Suppose now that the maker declares the provision for this sudden leap to have been made in the original construction of the machine — suppose him to foretell the change just before its occurrence. Do you esteem his skill greater, or less, than you would esteem it, if he should directly cause the change by touching a secret spring before your eyes? Evidently the proof of skill would be the greater, the more clearly it could be shown that the final result was all provided for in the original making. So, says Mr. Babbage, the universe may be a vast machine. It may be constructed in such a way that the general law of it shall be uniform phenomena, but with special provision for isolated events which this general law is insufficient to explain. The regular sequences of nature are the successive appearances of the integral numbers. Miracles are the sudden leaps from ten millions to a hundred millions. But both the regular sequences and the sudden leaps were all ordained at the beginning, the only difference between them being that the former occur according to known law,

while the latter reveal a law unknown except to the Contriver of the system.

Now, to such a view of miracles as this, we would not oppose a direct and universal negative. Certain of the Scripture miracles may be harmonized with this view. That miracles are called "wonders," "signs," "works," "powers," "new things," " wrought by the finger of God," does not disprove the theory, for God is said to work all things. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," said Christ, though here he spoke of his perpetual upholding of nature and government of history. The miracles might be "works of God" *par excellence*, simply because they waken in men's minds more distinctly the thought of the divine Being who is always present and always active whether men recognize him or not. Miracles on this view would be "unusual, while natural law is habitual, divine action. The natural is itself only a prolonged, and so unnoticed, supernatural." We could readily grant that that man was a believer in miracles who held this theory, provided he also held to a supernatural communication from God as coincident with it. Perhaps we cannot even demonstrate that this conception of the miracle is incorrect. At the same time we prefer the view which holds to immediate divine operation in the realm of nature as well as in the realm of mind, and that because of its greater fitness to accomplish the object aimed at in the miracle. That object is the giving of a sign. What is needed is the most indubitable proof of the divine intent to attest the commission of the person in connection with whose prediction or command the work is wrought. It is probable that the miracle, if wrought at all, will be so wrought as to secure its own signality. But upon the view here considered, this signality does not seem to be perfectly secured. For it would always be possible for the objector to assert that the so-called prophet had by merely human skill penetrated into the secrets of nature and discovered the law of the machine. There have been navigators who have used their knowledge of an approaching eclipse to convince a savage chief that they possessed superhuman powers and were entitled to divine homage, and threats backed up by an immediate darkening of the sun have proved very effectual. In the middle ages the telephone could have been used with great success to simulate a voice from heaven. Now, apart from the accompanying purity of life and doctrine which must distinguish the genuine miracle, we should naturally expect that there would also be such a method of bringing about the outward phenomenon, that there would be least chance of ascribing the knowledge of it to mere natural or scientific foresight. As Dr. Newman has said: "It is antecedently improbable that the Almighty should rest the credit of his revelation upon events which but obscurely implied his immediate presence."

Still another illustration of this view is given by Ephraim Peabody, and the mention of it may enable us to fix attention more clearly upon still another defect inherent in this method of explaining the miracle. "A story is told of a clock on one of the high cathedral towers of the older world, so constructed that at the close of a century it strikes the years as it ordinarily strikes the hours. As a hundred years come to a close, suddenly, in the immense mass of complicated mechanism, a little wheel turns, a pin slides into the appointed place, and in the shadows of the night the bell tolls a requiem over the generations which during a century have lived and labored

and been buried around it. One of these generations might live and die and witness nothing peculiar. The clock would have what we call an established order of its own; but what should we say, when, at the midnight which brought the century to a close, it sounded over the sleeping city, rousing all to listen to the world's age? Would it be a violation of law? No, only a variation of the accustomed order, produced by the intervention of a force always existing but never appearing in this way until the appointed moment had arrived. The tolling of the century would be a variation from the observed order of the clock; but, to the artist in constructing it, it would have formed a part of that order. So a miracle is a variation of the order of nature as it has appeared to us; but, to the Author of nature, it was a part of that predestined order — a part of that order of which he is at all times the immediate author and sustainer; miraculous to us, seen from our human point of view, but no miracle to God; to our circumscribed vision a violation of law, but to God only a part in the great plan and progress of the law of the universe."

Now it is evident that here, as in the illustration from the calculating engine, there is a law of recurrence. What happens with the clock at the end of one century will happen at the end of another. What happens at the ten million and first turn of the machine will happen again with the next series of similar turns. In the matter of miracles, however, such recurrence is wholly unproved. No one miracle is like another; they do not occur at regular intervals; both in quality and in quantity they bear all the marks of proceeding from spontaneity and freedom. If, therefore, we are to look to some unknown law of nature as the immediate physical cause and explanation of them, it must be a law which has in each case only one application. The theory would then assert only this, that God has provided in the construction of the universe for isolated and exceptional events along the course of history,— isolated and exceptional events which have for their office the confirmation of the claims of teachers sent by him,— isolated and exceptional events which cannot be brought under the law of the general order, nor under any law of special order among themselves. It is evidently a misuse of the term law, to speak of it as embracing such events as these, for law respects *classes* of phenomena, not isolated facts. Or if we strain the term *law* to embrace them, what does it mean more than simple command, the ordaining of an individual result? And how can this be distinguished from the direct volition of God except in the one respect, that his volition in the former case is executed by the use of means, whereas in the latter he simply speaks and it is done? But those with whom we argue are the last to claim that even the ordinary operations of nature are carried on without God. The world, while it has a separate existence and a measure of independence, is yet upheld by God's mighty will, so that nothing comes to pass in which he is not active as preserver and maintainer. He who imposed upon the universe the law of miracles must himself supervise its execution. Does such a law as this — a law which cannot execute itself — differ so essentially from divine volition, to make it worth while to quarrel about the name? And since we have evidence of the divine will in miracles, but no evidence, in the vast majority of cases, that natural means are employed in the working of them, is it not best to define them from the known rather than from

the unknown? We know that they are the result of divine volitions; in most cases we have no knowledge of intermediate agencies used in producing them. It seems most accordant with our knowledge, therefore, to regard the miracle, even apart from its coincidence with the word of a religious teacher, as an event in nature which, though not contravening any natural law, the laws of nature, even if they were fully known to us, would not be competent to explain.

That miracles are possible, however, does not prove them to be probable. To this question of the probability of miracles, let us now address ourselves. And here we find too frequently, among apologetical writers, a prior assumption that miracles are as probable as other and ordinary events. The attitude of these same apologists towards so-called modern miracles sufficiently shows that this assumption very imperfectly represents the facts. We are compelled to grant and we as frankly acknowledge that, so long as we confine our attention to nature, there is a presumption against miracles. The experience of each of us testifies that, so far as our observation has gone, the operation of natural law has been uniform. We perceive the advantages of this uniformity. A general uniformity is necessary in order to make possible a rational calculation of the future and a proper ordering of human life. But while we acknowledge this, we deny that this uniformity is absolute and universal. It is certainly not a truth of reason, that can have no exceptions, like the axiom that the whole is greater than any one of its parts. Perhaps the most striking instance of belief in the uniformity of nature is that which leads mankind to expect the rising of to-morrow morning's sun. But no one can examine this belief without being convinced that there is no necessity about it like the necessity that two and two should make four. Attempt to conceive of two and two making five, and you violate a first principle of reason. But there is no self-contradiction in the thought that to-morrow should see no sunrise. Experience of the past is not experience of the future. Experience of the past gives no absolute certainty of the future. "Like the stern lights of a ship," as Coleridge says, "it illuminates only the track over which it has passed." Hence experience cannot warrant belief in absolute and universal uniformity, except upon the absurd hypothesis that experience is identical with absolute and universal knowledge. Nor is it of any avail to point to the principal of induction — as if this bridged the gulf and converted the probable into the necessary; for induction of observed instances warrants only an *expectation* of the future — it never can prove that future to *exist* or to be of any definite *character*. Says Mr. Huxley: — "It is very convenient to indicate that all the conditions of belief have been fulfilled in this case of gravitation, by calling the statement that unsupported stones will fall to the ground a law of nature. But when, as commonly happens, we change 'will' into 'must,' we introduce an idea of necessity which has no warrant in the observed facts, and has no warranty that I can discover elsewhere. For my part, I utterly repudiate and anathematize the intruder. Fact I know, and law I know; but what is this necessity, but an empty shadow of the mind's own throwing?"

Any proper account of the inductive process must regard it as presupposing the uniformity of nature. But this uniformity of nature is not itself an ultimate truth — there is a greater truth back of that, namely, universal

design. From one or more observed instances I can argue to those which have not been observed, only upon the assumption that the universe has been rationally constructed, so that its various parts correspond to one another and to the investigating faculties of man. But this is virtually to say that the principle of final cause underlies the principle of efficient cause, and that this latter must find its limit in the former. In the words of Dr. Porter: "If efficient causes and physical laws must acknowledge themselves indebted to final causes in order to command our confidence, then they must also confess their *subjection* to the same and be ready to stand aside and be suspended whenever the principle of final cause shall require. In other words, the order of nature may be broken whenever the principle of final cause shall require; that is, whenever the claims of the so-called reason of things, or of alleged moral and religious interests, may demand an inroad upon its regularity either in special acts of creation or in exertions of miraculous agency." "The principle of final cause will not only render the service of sustaining our confidence in the stability of the laws of nature under all ordinary circumstances, but will also account for such extraordinary deviations from this order as may be required in the history of man." The qualifications to be made in the phraseology of Dr. Porter, as to suspension of law, will readily occur to us, after what has previously been said. The substantial truth remains intact that, since we cannot conduct the process of scientific induction at all without assuming that a principle of design pervades the universe and constitutes it a rational whole, the uniformity which we see about us is a uniformity which has its limitations in this very principle of design, and may be expected to give way when there exists a sufficient reason therefor in the mind of him who made it. If induction itself is founded upon design, then design is greater than induction, and may embrace facts for which mere induction can never account.

Not only is it not true that the uniformity of nature is a truth of reason, which admits of no exceptions, but it is true that science herself reveals the existence of breaks in this uniformity. The limited explorations of European geologists have given rise to the uniformitarian theory of the earth's progress. But the later investigations of Clarence King, Superintendent of the United States Survey of the Forty-ninth Parallel, conducted over an extent of territory such as British scientists have never traversed, have apparently demonstrated that cataclysms occurred in the past history of the planet so vast and so tremendous in their influence upon the various forms of life that only the most plastic of these forms survived. The edict went forth to every living creature: 'Change or die!' So the geological leaps were accompanied with biological leaps so great as to be equivalent to new creations. But not only in the changes from one organic form to another do we see evidence adverse to the theory of perpetually uniform sequences in nature. The introductions successively of vegetable life, of animal life, of human life, and finally of the life of Jesus Christ, are utterly inexplicable from their respective antecedents. Science knows absolutely nothing of spontaneous generation, absolutely nothing of the evolution of the organic from the inorganic, or of man's intellectual and moral powers from those of the brute. The new beginnings I have mentioned cannot be rationally accounted for except by the coming down upon nature of a power above

nature, in other words, by new creations in the absolute sense. When science can produce bacteria from ammonia and water, change any lower creature into a responsible being, construct a Christ out of a man consciously guilty, then and only then can she afford to speak slightingly of miracles.

The testimony of nature, then, is simply this: Although there is a presumption against miracles, there is nothing in experience or in the primitive ideas of the mind which renders investigation of their claims unnecessary. But there is another world than that of nature. The physical is supplemented by the moral, and finds in the moral its explanation and end. It is unscientific to conclude that miracles are improbable, simply upon the testimony of the physical universe; for the reason that the physical universe is but the half, and the lower half, of the great system. What is improbable when judged from the point of view of mere physics, may be eminently probable when judged from the point of view of morals. If then we can show that even the physical universe has relations to the moral, and is made to serve it, we do much to compel a transfer of the controversy from the physical, to the moral, realm. And this we maintain. There is a moral law inlaid in nature. We could conceive a system in which the violation of moral obligation might be accompanied with the highest physical well-being. Pride and even licentiousness might be the path to health. But the present order of the world is different. As the universe is at present constructed, honesty is the best policy. Sin is its own detecter and judge and tormentor. In the very framework of matter and of mind is inwrought the tendency to punish vice and reward virtue. The universe does not exist for itself alone — a great dumb show from age to age. The mere circling of world about world, growth and decay, life and death — these are not all. The universe has an end beyond and above itself. It is for moral ends and moral beings. So much is made plain to us by the inworking of the moral law into the constitution and course of nature. And if the universe is made to subserve moral ends, if it exists for the contemplation and use of moral beings, if it is constructed for the purpose of revealing to them God's law, and the God who is the source of law, then it is probable that the God of nature will produce effects aside from those of natural law, whenever there are sufficiently important ends to be served thereby. In short, if the moral ends for which the universe exists are not attained by the operation of natural law alone, it is probable that these ends will be attained by methods beyond and above those of natural law. All that is needed to render miracles probable is a '*dignus vindice nodus*,'—an exigency worthy of the interposition.

Is there such an exigency? We claim that the moral disorder of the world is such an exigency. This moral disorder is not a part of the original creation, nor is it the work of God. If it were, we should not hope for rectification. But it is man's work, and results from the free acts of man's will. To deny that man may mar the Creator's handiwork, is to deny consciousness and conscience. These testify to man's freedom and sole responsibility for moral evil; these testify that God is the hater and punisher of it. If now, through no fault of the maker, the watch has been suffered to get out of order so that it no longer fulfils its end of keeping time, shall any fancied sacredness about its mechanism prevent the rectification of that disorder, and the touch of the regulator by the maker's hand? In the original design

of the watch, the winding up and setting of the regulator were provided for. Subsequent repair and readjustment are but the carrying out of the ultimate purpose of the mechanism, that it should correctly mark the hours. And when the moral world, through no fault of its Author, has ceased to fulfil its end of representing and reflecting the divine holiness, shall it be thought improbable that God should make bare the arm which the garment of nature had hid, and make known his power by setting at work new principles of holiness and life? When the lower world has become so sundered from the higher as to forget its true meaning and end, is it strange that the higher should touch the lower, and that changes in this lower should result? We claim, therefore, that the existence of moral disorder consequent upon the free acts of man's will changes the presumption against miracles into a presumption in their favor, so that, in a true sense, the non-appearance of miracles would be the greatest of miracles.

Our judgment with regard to the probability of miracles will depend in great part upon the extent to which we perceive this moral disorder in the world and in our own breasts. The degree to which we perceive this will depend, in turn, upon the conception we cherish with regard to God. As Dr. Mozley has intimated, there are two ruling ideas of God. The one gathers round conscience, the other round a physical centre. The one looks upon God as the supreme mundane Intelligence, penetrating and pervading the physical universe, and manifested in all the tides of the world's life and civilization. The other regards him as the high and holy One — the God of infinite moral purity, whose voice conscience echoes, and who is the Governor and Judge of all human souls. If we take the former view exclusively or even predominantly, the regular order of nature's successions will seem a full and sufficient revelation of the Almighty, and then there is no place for miracles — they are an impertinence and a contradiction. But if we take the latter view, then the contrast between the spotless purity of God and the universal sin of the world will unspeakably affect us; the whole course of nature will seem out of joint, the end of creation unattained, and all things in heaven and earth, man's nature and God's nature as well, will seem to cry out for the world's deliverance and redemption. On this view, miracles have a place, and a fit place, in the whole scheme of things; they are antecedently probable. And therefore the denial of miracles on the part of those who hold the former view of God ought not to perplex us, or to shake our faith. They deny miracles, because they have not the whole evidence before them. The moral argument in favor of miracles has no force to them, because they have no eye for the facts on which it is based. But their not seeing them does annihilate them. The moral wants of the world, once apprehended, render miracles probable, as the accompaniments and attestations of a divine revelation.

Miracles are probable; but whether they have actually taken place is a question of evidence. What amount of testimony is necessary to prove a miracle? We reply: No more than is requisite to prove the occurrence of any other unusual, but confessedly possible, event. Hume indeed argued that a miracle is so contradictory of all human experience that it is more reasonable to believe any amount of testimony false than to believe a miracle to be true. But the argument is fallacious. It is chargeable with

a *petitio principii*. It assumes that a miracle is contrary to all human experience. But, by all human experience, Hume can mean only our personal experience. We have not seen a miracle. But others say that they have. To make our own experience the measure of all human experience, would make the proof of any absolutely new fact impossible. Even the evidence of our own senses would be insufficient to prove a miracle; for what is contrary to our past experience would be incredible. Even if God should work a miracle, he could, on this view, never prove it. What is this general experience of mankind, that is held to render the miracle incredible? It is merely negative experience. When one man testifies that he witnessed the commission of a certain crime, shall it be sufficient in rebuttal to bring a hundred men who were not present and who declare that they never saw any such thing? Negative testimony can never neutralize that which is positive, except upon principles which would invalidate all testimony whatsoever. And how do we know what general experience is? Why, only from testimony. Yet Hume commits the self-contradiction of seeking to overthrow our faith in human testimony, by adducing to the contrary the general experience of men of which we *know* only through testimony. Moreover, Hume's view requires belief in a greater wonder than those which it would escape. That multitudes of intelligent and honest men should, against all their interests, unite in deliberate and persistent falsehood, under the circumstances narrated in the New Testament record, involves a change in the sequences of the mental and spiritual world far more incredible than are the miracles of Christ and his apostles.

What have we now proved, and where does the argument thus far leave us? In our judgment, we have proved that, granting the fact of a revelation, miracles are necessary to attest it; that there is nothing in the relation of miracles to natural law to render them impossible; that there is nothing in the relation of miracles to the laws of evidence to render them improbable. They can be subjects of testimony, like other facts. Provided the facts are certified by witnesses who in other matters are recognized as competent and credible, there is no more rational warrant for rejecting miracles than for rejecting accounts of eclipses and of darkenings of the sun.

But because miracles are possible and probable, it does not follow that we must accept as miracle all that comes to us under that name. We are simply bound to consider without prepossession each case of the apparently miraculous that presents itself, and to decide it upon its own merits. Now we do not propose to take up the New Testament miracles singly and in detail. It will be sufficient to point out the proper course to be pursued in further investigation of the subject. That course, we are persuaded, is to take first of all that great central miracle upon which Christianity rests her claims and to which the church looks back as to the source of her life — I mean the miracle of Christ's resurrection. To that miracle we have as witnesses two of the evangelists and the Apostle Paul, each of whom personally saw Jesus after he had risen from the dead, and these witnesses represent the faith of a great body of early believers for whom they speak. "Like banners of a hidden army, or peaks of a distant mountain range, they represent and are sustained by compact and continuous bodies below." The accounts of these witnesses would have been contradicted if contradiction had been

possible. That multitudes believed their story, and against all their worldly interests became disciples of Christ, is proof that they believed it to be true. The existence of the church, the existence of Christianity itself, with its doctrines and its ordinances, is inexplicable except upon the hypothesis that what these witnesses believed, *was* true. The supposition of dream or delusion, of myth or romance, of apparition or imagination, is utterly incompetent to solve the problem how keen-witted and brave-hearted and truth-loving men became converts to a faith they had bitterly opposed, and went to imprisonment and martyrdom in its defense. It is irrational to suppose that this mighty fabric of Christian faith and life which has so blessed the world has its foundation either in fraud or in self-deception. But the resurrection of Jesus Christ, once granted, carries with it directly or indirectly all the other miracles of the New Testament. That one miracle proves Jesus Christ to be a teacher sent from God; proves his words to be a revelation from God to men; proves his asserted oneness with God and equality with God to be a fact. The coming of such a Being into history is the most wonderful of all events. From this point of view, the miracles of his life assume a new aspect. They are fit manifestations of the incarnate Deity, fit accompaniments of the miracles of his coming and his resurrection. But more than this, the miracles of the New Testament carry with them the miracles of the Old. These are the fitting preludes and preparations for the coming of God into the world which he created,—fitting signs and prophecies to make the world ready for the great event. And so, as a matter of fact, the great epochs of miracles are coincident with the great epochs of revelation. About Moses, the giver of the law, about the prophets as interpreters of the law, there are congeries of miracles. We find them just where we should expect them, the natural accompaniments and attestations of those new communications from God which at successive periods prepared the way for the coming of his Son. And this shows us why they have ceased. They were candles before the dawn—put out after the sun has risen; serving to draw attention to new truth, they naturally pass away when the truth has gained currency and foothold. Clustering around the person of the divine Redeemer and ceasing when his kingdom has been founded, they are to occur again only when he comes the second time in the clouds of heaven to usher in the final consummation.

Thus we regard the resurrection of Christ as the central proof of Christianity. For this reason it was a main subject of apostolic preaching and a main teaching of the ordinances. It remains to-day just what it then was. We challenge the world to dispute the fact of Christ's resurrection, and the fact being conceded, we challenge the world to show cause why it should not accept Christ and Christianity. This one fact of Christ's resurrection admitted, and the battle is substantially won. With regard to particular instances of miracle in the Old Testament or the New, there may be questions which we cannot answer and difficulties which we cannot solve. Christianity does not stand or fall with any single one of these, so long as the resurrection of Christ is held to be matter of history. We may not be able to mark the precise time when miracles ceased. There is reason to believe that they ceased with the first century, or at any rate with the passing away of those upon whom the apostles had laid their hands. So long as

the Scripture canon was incomplete, there was need of miracles. When documentary evidence was at hand, miracles were seen no longer. The fathers of the second century speak of miracles, but they confess that they are of a class widely different from the wonders wrought in the days of the apostles. And so of mediæval and modern miracles. The Scripture recognizes the existence of counterfeit miracles and denominates them 'lying wonders.' These counterfeit miracles, in various ages, argue that the belief in miracles is natural to the race and that somewhere there must exist the true. They serve to show that not all supernatural occurrences are of divine origin, and to impress upon us the necessity of careful examination before we give them credence. False miracles may commonly be distinguished from the true, by their accompaniments of immoral conduct or of doctrine contradictory to truth already revealed, as in modern spiritualism; by their internal characteristics of inanity or extravagance, as in the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, or in the miracles of the Apocryphal New Testament; in the insufficiency of the object which they are designed to further, as in the case of Apollonius of Tyana, or of the miracles said to accompany the publication of the doctrine of the immaculate conception; or finally, in their lack of substantiating evidence, as in mediæval miracles, which are seldom if ever attested by contemporary and disinterested witnesses.

A simple comparison of other so-called miracles with those of Scripture suffices to show the vast superiority of the latter in sobriety, in benevolence, in purpose, in evidence. Mahomet disclaimed all power to work miracles, and appealed to the Koran in lieu of them, so that its paragraphs are called *aiát*, or 'sign.' But later legends relate that Mahomet caused darkness at noon, whereupon the moon flew to him, and after going seven times round the Kaāba, bowed to him, then entered his right sleeve, and, slipping out at the left, split into two halves, which after severally retiring to the extreme east and west, were once more united to each other. These were truly signs from heaven, but they make no impression upon us. The fable of St. Alban, the first martyr of Britain, illustrates to us the nature of mediæval miracles. The saint walks about, after his head is cut off, and, that he may not be wholly deprived of that useful portion of his body, he carries it in his hand. Mediæval miracles were part of a complicated system of deceit and evil, constructed to further the secular interests of a domineering church. Antecedently improbable, from their connection with the organization of which they are the representatives, they fail to pass either of the tests which distinguish the true miracle from the false. But in the New Testament all these tests are met. Here is purity of life in the teachers who work them, accompanied by the proclamation of doctrine not only consistent with God's past teachings, but constituting the keystone of the arch of revelation; here are sobriety and grandeur, benevolence and wisdom, united in every act; here are objects worthy of divine intervention, the attesting of the divine commission of his Son and the certification that what he teaches is God's authoritative word of life and salvation; here is evidence of the occurrence of these miracles from eye-witnesses of keen discernment and irreproachable integrity, who had no conceivable motive for dishonesty, and who imperiled their lives by the testimony they gave — witnesses who mutually support

each other without the possibility of collusion, and whose testimony perfectly agrees with collateral facts and circumstances, so far as these can be ascertained from the most rigorous investigations into the literature and history of their time. No other religion professes to be attested by miracles at all; no other miracles of any age present evidence of their genuineness comparable to these. Indeed, the result of extended investigation is simply this: The Christian miracles are the only series of miracles that have the slightest claim to rational credence, yet no man can rationally doubt that the Christian miracles were wrought by God.

Here we might leave our theme. We make but one closing remark. The belief in many fancied manifestations of the supernatural has vanished with the advance of civilization. Sir Matthew Hale and his belief in witches are things of the past. But the belief in the Christian miracles has not vanished: it has not decreased; it sways a larger number of minds, and minds of higher quality and culture, to-day than ever before. With civilization, the belief in other wonders disappears. With civilization, the belief in the Christian miracles steadily and irresistibly advances. It is an instance of survival of the fittest. It is inexplicable, except by difference of kind between the faith and the superstition. And the faith whose progress is never retrograde, but whose dominion perpetually widens, unless the laws of mind and of history be changed in the interest of unbelief, must some day inevitably embrace among its adherents the total race of man.

X.

THE METHOD OF INSPIRATION.*

Among sincere believers in the all-pervading inspiration of the Scriptures, there are minor differences of opinion. These differences have respect chiefly to the method in which the Holy Spirit wrought upon the sacred writers. Some are unable to conceive of any inspiration which does not involve an external communication and reception. Richard Hooker, the great English Churchman of the sixteenth century, asserts that the authors of the Bible "neither spake nor wrote any word of their own, but uttered syllable by syllable as the Spirit put it into their mouths." We may call this the dictation-theory of inspiration. There are undoubtedly instances in which this method was used by God. When Moses went into the tabernacle, he "heard the voice speaking to him from between the cherubim." When John was in the Spirit on the Lord's-day, he was bidden to write certain definite words to the seven churches. But we conceive that this theory rests upon a very partial induction of Scripture facts. It unwarrantably assumes that occasional instances of direct dictation reveal the invariable method of God's communications of truth to the writers of the Bible.

There is another far larger class of facts which this theory is wholly unable to explain. There is a manifestly human element in the Scriptures. There are peculiarities of style which distinguish the productions of each writer from those of every other,— witness Paul's *anacoloutha* and his bursts of grief and of enthusiasm. There are variations in accounts of the same scene or transaction, which indicate personal idiosyncrasies in the different writers,— witness the descriptions of Mark as compared with those of Matthew. These facts tend to show that what they wrote was not dictated to them, but was in a true sense the product of their own observation and thought. They were not simply pens — they were penmen — of the Spirit. God's authorship did not preclude a human authorship also.

It has been sought to break the force of these facts by urging that the omniscient and omnipotent Spirit could without difficulty put his communications into all varieties of human speech. Quenstedt, the Lutheran theologian, declared that "the Holy Ghost inspired his amanuenses with those expressions which they would have employed, had they been left to themselves." We are reminded of Voltaire's idea that God created fossils in the rocks, just such as they *would* have been had ancient seas existed. A theory like this virtually accuses God of unveracity. In nature he has not made our senses to deceive us. Much less in his word has he led our minds astray by filling it with illusory indications of intellectual activity on the part of prophets and evangelists.

* Printed in the Examiner, Oct. 7 and Oct. 14, 1880.

We must remember, moreover, that large parts of the Scriptures consist of narratives of events with which the writers were personally familiar. It is inconsistent with any wise economy of means in the divine administration, that the Scripture-writers should have had dictated to them what they knew already, or what they could inform themselves of by the use of their natural powers. That Luke made diligent inquiry as to the facts which he was to record, he expressly tells us in the preface to his Gospel. If, after all this gathering of materials, Luke still required to have his Gospel dictated to him word for word, it is difficult to see the need of the preliminary investigations. Why employ eye-witnesses of the Saviour's life, like John? Might not the Gospel which proceeded from his pen have been equally well written by one who never saw the Lord, nay, by one who lived a thousand years before his coming?

It is sometimes said that these considerations, convincing as they may seem, can weigh nothing against the plain assertion of Paul that he speaks "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." A careful examination of this passage, however, will show that there is not only no dictation here, but that all such mechanical influence is by implication excluded. In what way are we to suppose that "man's wisdom teacheth?" By dictating word for word? Not at all. It is rather by so filling the writer's mind, that he uses words addressed to the merely natural tastes and opinions of men. So the speech "taught by the Spirit," or "learned of the Spirit," as we may better translate the phrase, is not the utterance of words dictated one by one by the Holy Ghost, but simply the expression of the thought with which the Spirit has filled the mind, in words of whose adequateness and appropriateness that same Spirit furnishes the guarantee. The passage teaches nothing more than that the general manner of discourse was ordered by God, so that the writers joined to the matter revealed by the Spirit words which they had also learned from the Spirit how to employ. In what precise way the Holy Spirit secured a right use of words we may or may not be able to determine. It is certain that this particular passage does not inform us,— much less does it constitute a direct affirmation of the dictation-theory of inspiration.

By way of transition to what seems to us a more reasonable conception of the general method of inspiration, we may add to all the preceding objections still one more. The theory of word-for-word dictation contradicts what we know of the law of God's working in the soul. The higher and nobler God's communications are, the more fully is the recipient in possession and use of his own faculties. To Joseph's dullness of perception God speaks in a vision of his sleep, but to Mary the angel of the annunciation delivers his message in her waking hours. We cannot suppose that the composition of the Scriptures, that highest work of man under the influence of God's Spirit, was purely mechanical. On the contrary, it seems plain to us that Psalms and Gospels and Epistles alike bear indubitable marks of having proceeded from living human hearts, and from minds in the most active and energetic movement. But, in order clearly to present our own view of God's method, it will be necessary to say a preliminary word with regard to the general matter of divine and human coöperation.

There are those who conceive of God's working and man's working as

mutually exclusive of each other. They cannot comprehend the possibility of an act's having man for its author in the most complete sense, and yet being in an equally complete sense the work of God. Yet just such coöperation of God and man is brought to our view in the apostle's injunction: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure." Even regeneration and conversion are respectively the divine and the human aspects of a change in which God and man are equally active, although logically speaking the initiative is wholly with God. But the highest and most wonderful proof and illustration of such union of divine and human activities is found in the person of the God-man, Jesus Christ. There surely the fact that a work is human does not prevent its being also divine, nor the fact that a work is divine prevent its being also human.

It is the great service to theology of Dorner, the distinguished German writer, that he has reiterated and emphasized this truth that man is not a mere tangent to God, capable of juxtaposition and contact with him, but of no interpenetration and indwelling of the divine Spirit. Every believer knows that the effect of God's union with his soul is only to put him more fully in possession of his own powers; in truth, he never is truly and fully himself until God is in him and works through him. Then only he learns how much there is of him, and of what lofty things he is capable. Now in this truth, as we conceive, lies the key to the doctrine of inspiration. The Scriptures are the production equally of God and of man, and are never to be regarded as merely human or merely divine. The wonder of inspiration — that which constitutes it a unique fact — is in neither of these terms separately, but in the union of the two. Those whom God raised up and providentially qualified, spoke and wrote the words of God, not as from without but as from within; and that, not passively, but in the most conscious possession and the most exalted exercise of their own powers of intellect, emotion and will.

Inspiration is a unique fact, and in attempting to illustrate our meaning, we run the risk of misleading. But let us run this risk, and trust to subsequent explanation to correct any false inferences from our illustrations. What dictation is, we know without any example. The merchant dictates a letter by word of mouth, and after it is written reads it over, and if it is correct authorizes the sending of it. It is his letter, though not a word of it is in his handwriting. This is the first method — a method employed, as we grant, in Scripture, though, as we also believe, only in rare and exceptional cases. There is a second method which may conceivably have been employed. In an interview with his confidential clerk, the same merchant may give the clerk a general idea of the letter which he desires to have written, but may leave the words and even the method of treatment in large degree to the clerk's discretion. Still it is the merchant's letter, not the clerk's. In fact, it would be to all intents and purposes his letter, had he given no special directions to his secretary, but had left him to be guided in his writing by what he knew of the general spirit and business methods of his employer, — that is, it would be the employer's letter, if it were accepted by that employer and sent forth by one authorized to act in his name. Now it is possible that the Scriptures might be the word of God, even though the

relation between the divine and the human authors should in some cases be no more close than this. God might raise up men and providentially prepare them for this special work; he might specially call them to it by inward impulse or by the outward certification of miracle, and though there should be no dictation and no suggestion of anything more than the general idea to be expressed, his acceptance of their work and publication of it as his own might constitute it as fully his word, as it would be if he had dictated every part.

But let us hasten to say, however, that the method of "general instructions" suggested by the illustration just given seems to us equally insufficient to account for the facts with the method of dictation previously spoken of. The only parts of the Scripture that could with any semblance of probability be thought of as composed in this way would be those portions which most closely resemble secular literature, such as the books of the Chronicles, or certain of the Psalms, or the Acts of the Apostles. But even here, the loftiness of tone, the absolute freedom from all proved historical error, the incidental inculcation of profound doctrine, the important significance of slight shades of expression, render it impossible for the Christian reader to avoid the conclusion that over the whole process of composition a wisdom higher than the wisdom of this world, even the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, must have presided. While we reject the dictation-theory of inspiration as an explanation of the general method in which the Scriptures were written, we reject as entirely and unqualifiedly the theory that God simply put his ideas into the minds of the sacred writers, and then left them, in independence of himself, to the hazardous and stupendous task of furnishing the whole method of treatment and the entire means of expression.

Is there a middle ground between these two extremes? Or rather, is there not a higher point of view from which all the truth which is in each of these theories may be grasped, while the error is excluded? We believe that there is. A third illustration will prepare the way for stating it. There are occasional experiences in the ministry of a faithful preacher of Christ's gospel, when the word of his master seems fulfilled: "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." After thorough and prayerful preparation, he appears before a public audience to utter God's truth with regard to sin and to salvation. As he proceeds in his discourse, the order of thought upon which he had fixed in his study seems like a track illumined with the clear light of heaven. All the surroundings and suggestions of the hour are lines converging toward his chosen end — the impressing of a definite truth upon the minds of his hearers. And that truth takes possession of his very soul; he feels its unutterable greatness, its supreme claims; he is dying to utter it — aye, the struggle of his nature is so great that he almost dies in the uttering of it — his very life seems to go out with his words. Such new powers of thought and feeling are roused to action within him, that he wonders at himself; and as for expression, it seems like the full flowing of an irrepressible fountain — words fit themselves to thought with an exactness and grace, a persuasiveness and power, of which he never deemed himself capable. In short, he becomes possessed with the truth, and he proclaims the truth, in a state of insight and exaltation that puts to shame all his common moods, and gives almost a taste of the

knowledge and love and power of seraphs before the throne. And those who hear are moved, at first they know not why; the speaker seems lost to sight, and God draws near; it is as if, like Moses, they were admitted to the inner sanctuary of the Almighty, and heard his voice from between the cherubim.

The sermon is ended, but not the thoughts of the preacher. What are those thoughts? If he be, as we have supposed, a true man of God, they will be thoughts of the deepest awe and humility. He will say: "God spoke, not I." He will praise God, and wonder that God has so distinguished him as to make him his mouth-piece and ambassador. But at the same time he will say: "To-day I was myself. I became aware of hitherto undiscovered powers. How great a thing it is to be a man, and to use my whole humanity for him who redeemed me!" Passivity, loss of consciousness and will, absorption in God till the human element becomes a merely selfless instrument and organ of the divine, these are precisely what his experience is not. Now the whole-souled movement of the man under the influence of the indwelling Spirit — this seems to us to be the best earthly analogy for the understanding of the fact of inspiration. As we have already intimated, this illumination of the preacher by the Holy Spirit is not itself inspiration, nor at the best does it furnish anything more than a partial illustration of one principal feature of that unique work of God. For inspiration may involve revelation of new truth, while illumination is never more than a quickening of man's cognitive powers to perceive the old; inspiration qualifies the subject of it to put God's truth into permanent and written form, while illumination merely enables the man to unfold and utter the word that has been written already; inspiration gives absolute and final authority, illumination confers an authority that is only subordinate and relative. But the preacher's illumination by the Holy Spirit furnishes a true analogy to inspiration in this one respect, namely, that it involves a complete union of divine and of human activities, in distinction from the independent working of two equal parties on the one hand, or the mere mechanical influence of dictation on the other.

The possibility of such working of God in the soul of man can be denied only by those who regard man's soul as a region so sacred and independent that God would not enter it if he could, and could not enter it if he would. There is a striking similarity between their view of inspiration and their view of miracles. In both cases they hold that the laws of nature are suspended or violated; in both cases the second causes are reduced to passivity. The attraction of gravitation must be annulled, in order that Elisha may cause the axe to float upon the surface of the water; the spiritual life of Paul must come to a temporary stand-still, that he may write the Epistle to Philemon. We consider these views to be based on a radically incorrect conception of the relation of God to the two worlds of matter and of mind. God is in nature and in mind already,— he can by special exercise of will transcend the powers of both, while yet these powers are working in full intensity. As gravitation is in operation even while the hand of God keeps the iron from sinking, so all the laws of man's mental and moral nature are in operation at the same time that God uplifts and guides them in inspiration.

The opinion which we have been controverting has been cherished by

many excellent men, from a conviction that it alone befitted the majesty of God, and secured the sacred writers from errors arising from their merely human methods of thought and expression. But when we consider that man was originally made to be inhabited and energized by God, it seems more in accordance with God's plan that he should speak *through* man, than merely *to* him. The exaggeration of the divine element seems to us as serious an error as the exaggeration of the human. Dorner well calls it the *docetic* view of inspiration. It virtually holds that not the writers, but only the writings, were inspired. When we lose sight of the real human authorship of the sacred books, we incur a loss comparable only to that which we should sustain by letting go the human side of our Redeemer's person. A great part of the power of the Bible over us, like the attraction of Christ, arises from its coming to us with the voice and the sympathies of our common humanity. Inspiration took into account this fact. It therefore did not remove, but rather pressed into service, all the personal peculiarities of the writers, together with their defects of culture and literary style. In fact, every imperfection not inconsistent with truth in a human composition may exist in inspired Scripture. The Bible is the "word of God," but we may also say of it, in a peculiar sense, that it is the "word made flesh." It presents to us truth in human forms. It is a revelation, not for a select class, but for the common mind. And rightly understood, this very humanity of the Bible is one of the best proofs of its divinity.

Precisely how much of new knowledge and power was added to each particular Scripture writer by the fact of his inspiration, it is not necessary or possible for us to determine. In our judgment, the chief source of error in common treatises on inspiration is the assumption that the Holy Spirit must always have wrought in some uniform measure, or by the use of some uniform means. On the other hand, that seems to us the best definition of inspiration, which defines nothing as to the extent or manner of the influence of the indwelling Spirit. It is enough to say that inspiration is that special influence of God upon the minds of the Scripture writers, in virtue of which their productions, apart from errors of transcription and when rightly interpreted, together constitute an infallible and sufficient rule of faith and practice. So long as inspiration is regarded as an influence upon the minds, in distinction from the hands, of the writers, we may grant as unlimited variety in the means used by God to enlighten them, as there is in the means he uses for enlightening a sinner at conversion. Inspiration is not to be defined by its method, but by its result. It is a general term, including all those kinds and degrees of the Holy Spirit's influence which were brought to bear upon the minds of the Scripture writers in order to secure the putting into permanent and written form of the truth best adapted to man's moral and religious needs. Inspiration may often include revelation, or the direct communication from God of truth to which man could not attain by his unaided powers. It may include illumination, or the quickening of man's mind to understand truth already revealed. Inspiration, however, does not necessarily and always include either revelation or illumination. It is simply the divine influence which secures a correct transmission of the truth to the future; and, according to the nature of the truth to be transmitted, it may be only an inspiration of superintendence, or it may be, at the same time, an inspiration of illumination or of revelation.

This seems to be the meaning of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he tells us that in Old Testament times God spoke to the fathers through the prophets in many parts and in many ways. Inspiration, therefore, may be best regarded as a bestowment of various kinds and degrees of knowledge and aid, according to need, sometimes suggesting new truth, sometimes presiding over the selection of preëxisting material, though always guarding from error in the final elaboration. It did not always, nor even generally, involve a direct communication to the Scripture writers of the words they wrote. Thought is possible without words, and in the order of nature precedes words. The Scripture writers appear to have been so influenced by the Holy Spirit, that they perceived and felt even the new truths they were to publish as discoveries of their own minds, and were left to the action of their own minds in the expression of these truths, with this single exception that they were supernaturally held back from the selection of wrong words, and when needful were provided with right ones. Inspiration is therefore verbal as to its result, but not verbal as to its method.

Yet in all this work of preparation and composition, although the writers of Scripture used their natural powers and opportunities as fully as they would have done in purely secular composition, they were possessed and animated by the Spirit of God. Notwithstanding the ever-present human element, there is an all-pervading inspiration of the Scriptures which constitutes these various writings an organic whole. The Bible is in all its parts the word of God. Hence each part is to be judged, not by itself alone, but in its connection with every other part. The Scriptures are not to be interpreted as so many merely human productions by different authors, but also as the work of one divine mind. In many an expression of prophet or apostle, that divine mind may have intended to communicate more than was present to the consciousness of the human author. Seemingly trivial things are to be explained from their connection with the whole. One history is to be built up from the several accounts of the life of Christ. One doctrine must supplement another. The Old Testament is part of a progressive system, whose culmination and key are to be found in the New. The central subject and thought which binds all parts of the Bible together, and in the light of which they are to be interpreted, is the person and work of Jesus Christ.

This, then, is the sum of what we have said: The Scriptures, except in portions of insignificant extent, were not on the one hand written from dictation, nor on the other hand composed by men who derived their general ideas from God, while they were left to themselves so far as the expression of those ideas was concerned. Rather must we hold to a possession and enlightenment of the writers in all parts of their work, yet such a possession and enlightenment as left them in the fullest exercise of their natural powers. When they wrote, they wrote in the method and vocabulary of their time, and out of their present conscious experience under the influence of the Spirit. Balaam could not have written the Gospel according to John, nor could Paul have indited the Pentateuch. When they made researches they were guided by God; when they committed the results of their researches to writing, he kept them back from error either in matter or in expression. When they were called to prophesy of things to come, the Holy Spirit

opened the future to them; when they gave directions to the churches, they did it in the wisdom which only the Holy Spirit could impart. But in all this there was nothing blind, nothing mechanical, nothing passive. They were as truly the authors of what they wrote as was the Holy Spirit. As John Locke said: "When God made the prophet, he did not unmake the man."

Two questions need to be answered before this discussion can be regarded as sufficient. The first is this: Are all parts of Scripture inspired? We reply: All parts of Scripture are inspired in their connection and relation to each other. No statement of the Bible can be taken out from its context, and be called complete truth by itself. We read in Scripture the words: "There is no God;" but we have no difficulty in holding these to be inspired when we take them as part of the verse: "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God." This principle is of universal application, and next to the principle of combined human and divine authorship, we regard this one of the articulated and organic unity of all Scripture as the most important to an understanding of the fact of inspiration. — The second question is this: Are there degrees of inspiration? We answer: There are degrees of value, but not degrees of inspiration. Each part of Scripture is rendered completely true, when interpreted according to its actual meaning, and completeness has no degrees. All parts of the human body have life, and all are indispensable to the perfect whole. Yet we should miss the brain more than we should miss the hair that covers it, and the heart more than the hand into which it sends its blood. For all this, he would talk absurdly who should speak of the different parts of the body as having different degrees of life. So the Gospels may be of greater value to us than the minor prophets, and yet the inspiration of the latter be as complete as that of the former.

Thus we have endeavored to set forth a connected view of the method of inspiration. We have approached the subject without controversial reference to recent discussions of it — with irenic, rather than polemic, intent. We are convinced that the contemplation of the theme from the point of view which we have chosen, however imperfect and fragmentary our own treatment may have been, will enlarge our conceptions not only of the mysterious greatness, but also of the genuine reasonableness, of the doctrine of inspiration.

XI.

CHRISTIAN INDIVIDUALISM.*

Every man has his gift, and he is responsible for that. It was none of Peter's business what John had to do, and Jesus told him so. Peter's business was to follow Christ himself. Here we are taught the doctrine of Christian individualism. It is not every one who appreciates his individuality. Some people fancy that God creates things in lots; that he cares only for the species; that all the members of a race are essentially alike. But they should learn better. The telescope reveals a variety in God's works above us. Stars are of many magnitudes and many colors, single and double, satellites and suns. One star differeth from another star in glory, and the heavens in ten thousand ways illustrate the manifold wisdom of God. On the earth itself, the naturalist and the botanist find not only an ever-increasing number of species, but within the bounds of each species a greater and greater number of varieties. No two clover-leaves and no two blades of grass are precisely alike. Men of science are beginning to discern a seemingly endless versatility in nature. So inexhaustible are the resources of invention displayed, that no man can hope to accomplish anything unless he gives his life to the study of a very limited field. And if the inquirer be devout, he sees God in this variety of the world, and cries with the Psalmist: "O Lord, how manifold are thy works! in wisdom hast thou made them all."

God's freedom is illustrated by individuality in nature, as his unifying and organizing mind is exhibited in the classes and laws of nature. Diversity in unity, and unity in diversity, seems to be his aim. There is no need that any two things should be precisely alike, for the wisdom of God is infinite. And if this is so in the irrational creation, much more is it true of man, whose glory is that he resembles God in freedom. No two faces were ever absolutely alike — even twins always differ. The few lines of the human countenance are so manipulated by the divine Artist, that there are ten thousand thousand distinguishable shades of expression. Why then should we think that *souls* are alike? In that more delicate and plastic material, the invisible spirit, what an incalculable multitude of differences there must be! The Germans call Jean Paul Richter "*Der Einzige*,"—"the unique," — and the epithet indicates the love they bear him as the communicator of a fresh and peculiar impulse to their literature. But each of us, as well as Jean Paul, is a unique personage. Each "dwells like a star, apart;" each is solitary, impenetrable to any other. Each has his own gifts, his own tendencies, his own powers, his own capacities for joy and for suffering.

* Preached at Vassar College, February 28, 1886, as a sermon on the text, John 21: 21, 22—"What shall this man do? . . . . . What is that to thee? Follow thou me."

We do not know ourselves, until some great crisis of our history reveals to us the unsuspected depths of our natures. Then we discover a capacity for almost boundless sorrow, for agonizing remorse, for consuming desire, for overwhelming joy. We see that there is more of us, a hundred times over, than we had ever imagined; that we are fearfully and wonderfully made; that there are powers of thought and feeling and will within us that make us immortal; that we stand over against God with personalities as single and unique as his own. So we step out from the crowd and become conscious of our manhood or our womanhood; but with the new sense of our dignity in the creation, we learn for the first time of a responsibility which we must bear, and of a destiny which we must determine.

Now from this fact of individuality, which we recognize when once it is stated to us, there follow certain inferences which are not so obvious, but which it is my main purpose this morning to impress upon you, The first is this: *If every man is a peculiar being, then every man is guilty of peculiar sins.* By this I mean, that in your individual character and life there are certain embodiments and manifestations of sin such as are not to be found anywhere else in the universe. You have not sinned just as other people have. You have had peculiar gifts and opportunities, which have made you capable of a peculiar sort of transgression. No one else could have sinned just as you have, because no one else is just like you. You have not simply repeated the common sin of the race; for in you there is a new and unique centre of force which does more than express the past: it adds to the past, it makes a character and influence of its own. You have not simply imitated and reproduced the evil examples of others — you may have done that, but you have put your own stamp upon every deed. There is something very solemn in that word "character." It meant originally the mark which the engraver makes upon the metal or the stone. Then it came to mean the collective result of his various chiselings and cuttings. And when we speak of human character, we imply that each human being is, with every act and desire and thought, making a mark upon the imperishable substance of his soul. And in this artistic work of carving out his character each one of us shows a fearful originality.

If you should find in the woods some peculiar species of poisonous plant or venomous reptile, and should be told that it was no descendant from races of the past, but was a new creation, you would start back from it with an added horror. Now your sins are just such new creations. Man can create nothing else without God but that, but he can create sin, and he has created it. And you have exercised your mysterious prerogative by bringing into being acts, and desires, and thoughts of transgression, such as no other being in the universe has ever originated. Being yourself different from every other creature, you have been able to use your will in a course of transgression perfectly individual and unique. There are peculiar aggravations of your sins, arising from the peculiar light you have had and the peculiar grace you have resisted. Your sins, for this reason, have constituted a peculiar insult to the divine holiness, and they have had a peculiar evil influence over others. There is a peculiar account that you have to render to God. God's righteousness could never be vindicated by judging you as one of a mass. You must stand singly and alone before the judgment

seat of Christ. There each shall receive according to the deeds done in hi own body. And there, for me and for you, if we are unsaved, must be an unveiling of the secrets of the heart and the visiting upon each of a peculiar guilt, and shame, and condemnation. Ah, when I think of my individual sins, with all their peculiar aggravations, I can see how, in some particulars and aspects, I may be in my unique personality an illustration of the enormity and hatefulness of sin such as neither earth nor hell can elsewhere show. And what is true of me is true of you. In virtue of this great fact of individuality, both you and I should call ourselves, as Paul called himself, the "chief of sinners;" should acknowledge, with the prophet Amos, our "manifold transgressions" and "mighty sins;" aye, each one of us should cry, as the Publican cried, "God be merciful to me, the sinner," as if there were no other sinner upon the footstool so great as he.

A second inference is this: *If every man is a peculiar being, then a peculiar wisdom and grace of God are needed to save him.* It is not enough for God to decree salvation for the church as a whole. He must set his love upon me and choose me. A merely general election might not include a case so singular as mine has been.—It will not do for Jesus to die simply for the race at large. He must die for me, as if there were no other to be saved: for only a most particular and personal sacrifice of the Son of God could reach my case and atone for my sins. And so the believer looks to the cross and says: "My sins gave sharpness to the nails, and pointed every thorn." "The Saviour died for me." "He loved me, and gave himself for me."—It will not do for Christ to offer a merely general pardon to offenders. No, there is something in every sinner's case, when the Holy Spirit enlightens him, that seems so peculiarly wicked as to go beyond all ordinary bounds of sin, to make him an exceptional case of transgression, and to put him beyond the reach of mercy. The convicted sinner feels like Peter, after he had denied his Master, that though there may be salvation for others, there can be none for him. But just as Christ after his resurrection said: "Go, tell Peter," and so intimated the granting of a special pardon for his particular case, so to every such sinner he sends by his Holy Spirit a special message of forgiveness, and says: "Thy sins, which are many, are forgiven thee; go in peace."—It is not enough that Jesus should ask blessings for his followers in the mass, now that he has ascended his throne; for my needs are such as are found nowhere else but in my own soul. He must intercede particularly for me, with my idiosyncrasies and special temptations; for the grace that saves others will never be sufficient to save me. Christ can say to me, as he said to Peter: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not."—It is not enough that Christ should bestow on me simply the common influences of his Spirit,—the same influences which are bestowed upon all. There are peculiar depths of my nature that must be reached; peculiar and serpentlike convolutions of my wicked heart that must be untwisted; peculiar intensities of evil ambition and self-exaltation that must be subdued, if I am ever to be saved. To convert and to sanctify each sinner, demands a mighty operation and process of the divine Spirit, different from any other that he has ever wrought.—It is not enough that God should lead me by his Providence as he leads others. No, "he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out." "He leadeth me,"

aye, "he leadeth the blind by a way that they knew not"—knew not, because no other soul ever was so led, or could be.

Does not this strange fact of our individuality throw light upon our past experience? You have sometimes asked: "Why hast thou made me thus?" "Why hast thou so dealt with me?" Well, it is evident, at least, that there has been a peculiar dealing of God, corresponding to your peculiar nature. You needed a peculiar care and discipline, and just what you needed God has given to you. Is it not a matter of profound gratitude that infinite wisdom can give a personal attention to you and your salvation, as perfectly as if there were no other to care for in the universe? My friends, we are not saved in a lump. There are peculiar dealings of God with each individual soul. My experience is mine, and yours is yours, and there is no possibility of exchanging them. Just as each separate soldier has an experience of his own in battle, and just as each rescued passenger can tell a different story of shipwreck, so each history of salvation will have a thrilling interest of its own. No other being in all God's universe has been saved just as I have been. The multitude of God's thoughts toward me is more than I can number. In the record of its varied experiences under the mighty influences of God's Providence and God's Spirit, shall be made known by the church, to the principalities and powers in heavenly places, the manifold wisdom of God. Each soul redeemed and brought to glory shall have a new name, which no one knoweth but he that receiveth it—the sign manual of God stamped upon him in a way unique and incommunicable. And each soul will sing with an emphasis and meaning all its own:

> "Amazing grace, how sweet the sound,
> That saved a wretch like me!"

There is a third inference: *If every man is a peculiar being, then every man has a peculiar work for God to do.* Just as there was a man sent from God whose name was John, and that John the Baptist had a peculiar work to do, corresponding to his nature and endowments, so there is another man sent from God whose name is—*your* name, whatever that may be. It is not for nothing that God has made you just as you are, and has treated you just as he has. The children's hymn explains it all:

> "Dare to do right, dare to be true:
> You have a *work* that no other can do!"

"Every man for himself"—in a Christian sense. As you are peculiarly constituted, as you have peculiar gifts and opportunities, as you have had a peculiar experience of God's forbearing love and saving grace, so you peculiarly represent Christ, so you are to reflect a peculiar honor on your Savior and your King. There is a peculiar testimony you can give to Christ which no other man on earth can give. Secret communications of God's truth and grace have been made to you. They are hid from all the universe besides. Your peculiar course of development and education is a matter of interest to angelic beings, and it is you who are to make known what God has done for you. There is a peculiar crown which you, and no other, can cast at the Redeemer's feet; aye, throughout eternity, there is a peculiar phase of the image of Christ which you are to reflect, and a peculiar service to him which you are to render, and a peculiar glory which you are to give to his great name.

I confess that I rejoice to think that I am to be of some peculiar use: that I can do something that no other being can do; that God has made me an indispensable part of his plan of revealing himself to the universe. How is it with you, my hearer? Do you not think it a great thing to be made something of by God? And do you not see the folly and the crime of wishing to be somebody else; of hiding yourself behind somebody else; of neglecting your own work because somebody else does not do his? When the master in the parable went into a far country, he apportioned to his servants, "to every man his work." The talents were distributed to every man according to his ability. Paul explains the parable when he says: "To each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit, to profit withal." And Peter tells the whole story of our duty, when he says: "As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." In other words: God's grace is manifold, varied, multitudinous, as the number of his redeemed. Each rescued soul, however humble, has his peculiar endowment of nature and of the spirit. According to the quality and extent of God's gifts to us, we are to minister to others, as faithful stewards who have received these gifts, not that we may spend them upon ourselves, but that we may employ them for the interest of the owner, and for the good of the souls whom he died to save.

I would that this solemn thought of the peculiarity of our work might not be lost upon us. It is so easy to think that if we do not do our work some one else may do it for us. Oh, remember that, being different from every other, no other man or angel can ever take your place. If you do not do your work, your work will not be done. It is so easy to say: "I will do this, upon condition that some other person will do that." Oh, remember that you are a solitary individual before God, and that he says to you as Christ said to Peter, when he asked what John should do: "What is that to thee? follow thou me." It is so easy to make others doing, or ability to do, the measure of our own. Oh, remember that each one of us shall give account of himself to God; that to whom much has been given, of him much shall be required; that even he who had the one talent, and hid it, was cast out and rejected, because he had not made it into two.

I have said that this individuality implies peculiar sins on our part and peculiar grace on the part of God. I have said that it implies that every man has a peculiar work for God to do. But our theme will not be complete without a fourth inference. *If every man is a peculiar being, then for every faithful worker there is a peculiar reward.* Rewards in God's administration are matters of grace, not of debt; and yet we are to be rewarded "according to our works." Not *on account of* our works, as if by working we could put God under obligation to us, but *according to* our works — in proportion to what we have done and the faithfulness with which we have done it. There is a sense in which the rewards of all shall be the same. The laborers in the vineyard each one received his penny. So in the great future all souls will be equally full of the love and goodness of God — full to the utmost measure of their capacity. But then their capacities shall differ, and one shall be able to hold more than another. A small pail can be just as full as a great tub, but the great vessel can hold much more than the small one. And the difference in reward shall be determined

by the peculiarities of the service each man has rendered. He who gives even the cup of cold water in the name of a disciple shall in no wise lose his peculiar reward. The servant whose pound has gained five pounds shall be rewarded with authority over five cities, and the servant whose pound has gained ten pounds shall be rewarded with authority over ten.

But the peculiarity of the reward shall be graduated, not only to the peculiarity of the work that each has done, but to the peculiarity of the nature of him who receives it. Joy shall be the reward of heaven — but it shall be in each case a joy with which a stranger intermeddleth not. "Your joy no man taketh from you." It is a joy which the highest archangel cannot share, because it is the vibrating of all the strings of a peculiar nature at the soft touch of the fingers of infinite Love.—Power shall be the reward of heaven. The power of complete self-mastery will be a peculiar reward, because no other soul in the universe can know the struggles through which your soul has passed in resisting its peculiar temptations and in subduing its peculiar sins. George Eliot once said that the reward of a duty done is the power to do another. As with every new work for Christ accomplished we pass on to larger and larger achievement, peculiar power of service shall be the reward of the peculiar gifts and endowments which we lay at the Master's feet.—Love shall be the reward of the faithful — a love that shall admit the great love of God to fill up all the interstices and gaps and emptinesses of our natures, as water poured into a bowl not only fills it full, but adapts itself to the peculiar form of the vessel that contains it.—Holiness shall be the reward of the faithful. There is a mineral called diaphane that becomes transparent only in water. It shall be the blessing of heaven that this being of ours, now so clouded and opaque through the effects of sin, shall be immersed in the divine purity, and in that bath of regeneration shall be made pure as God is pure.—God himself shall be the reward of heaven — a God who can adapt himself with infinite inventiveness and wisdom to every peculiarity of the beings he has made, can be seen from a different point of view by every separate mind, and can be felt in a different way by each separate heart of all those he has redeemed. Shakspeare has been called the myriad-minded, but there is no end to the sides and aspects of God's being, and no finite mind can know the whole. The great reward of heaven will be that each redeemed soul can say: "O, God, thou art my God!"

So the reward will be peculiar, as the nature, and the sin, and the grace, and the work, are peculiar. The reward will be the raising to the highest power, and the exalting to the intensest activity, of that peculiar faculty and endowment which God imparted to the soul at the beginning. Here is a Christian evolution that passes in grandeur and dignity all that material evolution of which scientific men delight to speak. They tell us of a world thrown off from a fiery revolving nebula, chaotic and formless at the first, but gradually assuming outline and order, and bringing forth a constantly increasing variety of life and beauty. I can hear the sons of God shouting for joy, as God says "Let there be light!" and the ordered sphere goes whirling by; and I can conceive of those same angelic hosts adoring yet more that wisdom that in the long course of its subsequent history has made the germinal world planted so long ago amid the great spaces of the universe to

develope into such beauty and glory of mountain and field and flood. But there is another evolution grander than all this. It is found in the history of a redeemed soul. Springing at its beginning from the creative hand of God, a mere rudimentary germ of life and mind, it passes into the chaos and night of sin, until that same omnipotent Word that called the light out of darkness causes to shine in upon it the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Then the long training of the rescued spirit, through providence and grace, through temptation and affliction, through Christian work and achievement, until the soul reaches a full-orbed manhood in Christ Jesus. On and still on shall the process go, labor becoming more and more the highest rest, work becoming more and more reward, every faculty developed to greatness, every peculiar excellence brought to a unique and unexampled beauty, until as the sons of God see this spiritual product of God's wisdom go sweeping by, they shall be compelled to say that it passes in glory all the thrones and dominions and principalities and powers of their celestial hierarchy, that its history illustrates God's might and foreseeing wisdom better than all the material worlds that float in space, that its heights of intellectual and moral greatness are more glorious than the whiteness of Alpine summits when smitten by the first light of the rising sun, that its capacities for loving and expressing God are greater than the depths of ocean when they reflect the untroubled glory of the starlit skies.

When I think of the magnificent developments of individuality which the great future shall witness, of the grand array of crowned heads which heaven will present, each one a ruler over his own principality and all of them kings and priests unto God, I look back with horror to the awful perversity of Satan's lie to our first parents: "Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil." Seeking to be a God to himself, all these noble prospects of endless development were blasted and swept away. But in Christ they are all restored. It is not yet made manifest what we shall be, but we know that if he shall be manifested we shall be like him, for we shall see him even as he is. Eye hath not seen, nor hath ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man, what God hath prepared for them that love him. We shall judge angels, and all things shall be ours, because we are Christ's, and Christ is God's. It was written of ancient judges: "I said ye are gods." The name of gods was given them, because they were the representatives of God and were filled with his Spirit. So we shall be gods in the world to come, because in this unique and peculiar nature which belongs to each of us God shall dwell and manifest himself. We shall shine like the sun in the kingdom of our Father, because we live forever in the light of him who is the one and only Sun.

God help us then each one to say: "I am unlike every other soul that God ever made. I have sinned as no other ever has. He has saved me, and led me, in a different way from any other. I owe to him therefore a kind and quality of service such as no other human being has ever rendered. I am bound to have views of truth and of duty such as no other Christian ever had. I am bound to mark out for myself a course of spiritual development and a plan of outward work that shall be as original as the leadings of God. So only can I be a true man in Christ, an independent actor in history, a living force under God in the development of his plans, a king forever in

God's kingdom." It is to this lofty development of Christian individuality that God calls us — to be Christ's lieutenants in the universe. Oh, you who love power! take the lasting, the eternal power that comes through serving Christ. Use mind, heart and will, your ability to plan and to give, your voice and influence, your capacity to work and your power of getting others to work — use all these in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ now and here, and he will not only fill you with his Spirit and make you a master of circumstances and a master of men, but he will perpetuate your power beyond death, and increase it throughout the great hereafter; for he himself has said: "To him that overcometh, will I give to sit down with me in my throne, even as I also overcame and sat down with my Father on his throne."

XII.

THE NEW THEOLOGY.*

The New Theology, so called, is a theology of exaggerated individualism. What this means, and what are the errors and probable results of the system, will appear as we go on. It is well to remember, however, that the new always has its roots in the old, and before describing the phenomenon of the present I wish to mention some of its historical connections in the past.

I trace the history of this tendency in theology as far back as to the nominalism of Roscelin, Duns Scotus, and Occam. To these philosophers, general conceptions have their source only in the mind; there is nothing corresponding to them in the actual world. Genera and species are mere names; individuals are the only realities. Upon this view, science is the study only of units: in truth, there can be no science, for science would imply law and the binding of particulars into unity.

There is of course a realism equally objectionable — the realism which would hold to the independent existence of universals — the horse in general, apart from all individual horses. With Dr. H. B. Smith, we "hold to *universalia in re*, but insist that the universals must be recognized as *realities*, as truly as the individuals are."

There have been two chief applications of this nominalistic principle in theology: the first is its application to the nature of God; the second, its application to the nature of man. In the former case the result has been either a practical tritheism on the one hand, which denies the possibility of a divine nature without a divine person, and so holds that there must be three Gods because there are three who possess a divine nature; or on the other hand a practical unitarianism, which holds that as there is but one God, so only one person can possess the divine nature. Nestorianism for a similar reason held that Christ was two persons instead of one, because it could not conceive of human nature in him without independence and individuality.

Nominalism has, moreover, conceived of the divine attributes as mere names, with which, by a necessity of our thinking, we clothe the one simple divine essence. It holds that the attributes are not distinct from God's essence or from each other. This is to deny that we can know God at all; for knowing is not possible without distinguishing. Yet this false tendency to regard God as a being of absolute simplicity has infected much of the post-reformation theology, and is found as recently as Schleiermacher, Rothe, and Olshausen. Schleiermacher makes all the attributes to be modifications of power; Rothe, of omniscience; and Olshausen attempts to prove that the

* Printed in the Baptist Quarterly Review, for January, 1888.

Word of God must have objective and substantial being, by assuming that knowing is equivalent to willing; whence it would seem to follow that, since God wills all he knows, he must will moral evil. It is only an application of the same principle when we find Horace Bushnell, one of the progenitors of the New Theology, identifying righteousness in God with benevolence, and denying for that reason that any atonement needs to be made to God. Herbert Spencer only carries the principle further when he concludes God to be simple unknowable force. Hence we can adopt the statement of Thomasius: "If God were the simply One, τὸ ἁπλῶς ἑν, the mystic abyss in which every form of determination were extinguished, there would be nothing in the unity to be known." Hence "nominalism is incompatible with the idea of revelation. We teach, with realism, that the attributes of God are objective determinations in his revelation, and as such are rooted in his inmost essence."

More important, however, for our present purpose is the application of nominalism to the nature of man. Mankind upon this view is but a collection of individuals. The race is not an organic whole. Souls are individually created by God, not propagated with the body from a common stock. There is no such thing as an archetypal humanity, of which each man is a natural evolution and a partial illustration. The genus "man" is but a name which we attach to the multitude of individual men. This is the atomistic account of humanity; individual men have as little organic connection with each other as the sand-grains in a sand-hill. They influence one another as do the bricks which children set up in a row — each receives the impact of its next neighbor entirely from without, and there is no living unity between them. Hence there can be no common fall of humanity in its first father — each man falls by himself and for himself, just as each angel did. It would seem to follow that there can be no common salvation, and that Christ can be no more the source of a new humanity to believers, than Adam was the source of sin and guilt to the race at large. There is no condemnation in Adam, there is no justification in Christ; for there is no real union of humanity with either.

Over against this nominalistic conception of humanity, I put the realistic doctrine which I regard as implicitly contained in Scripture. This regards humanity at large as the outgrowth of one germ. Let me illustrate my meaning. Though the leaves of a tree appear as disconnected units when we look down upon them from above, a view from beneath will discern the common connection with the twigs, branches, trunk, and will finally trace their life to the root, and to the seed from which it originally sprang. So the race of man is one, because it sprang from one head. Its members are not to be regarded only atomistically, as segregated individuals; the deeper truth is the truth of organic unity. Yet we are not realists of the mediæval sort. We do not believe in the separate existence of universals. Our realism only asserts the real historical connection of each member of the race with its first father and head, and such a derivation of each from him as makes us partakers of the character which he formed. Adam was once the race; when he fell, the race fell; we have the very nature which transgressed and corrupted itself in him. I may add that the new conceptions of the reign of law and of the principle of heredity which prevail in modern science

are working to the advantage of Christian theology. The doctrine of Adam's natural headship is only a doctrine of the hereditary transmission of character from the first father of the race to his descendants. I do not deny man's individuality and personal responsibility; I only deny that this is the whole truth. Besides personal sin, there is race-sin. The New Theology is false by defect. It is the theology of nominalism. It regards man simply as an individual. It holds that each human soul is immediately created by God and has no other relations to moral law than those which are individual; whereas, all human souls are organically connected with each other, and together have a corporate relation to God's law, by virtue of their derivation from one common stock.

The second source to which I trace the New Theology is the idealism of Berkeley, Hume, Kant, and Hegel, or rather the modern idealism of which these philosophers are earlier and later representatives. This general method of thought regards the mind as conversant only with ideas. The tendency has its root in Locke's teaching that all the materials of our knowledge come originally from sensation; the mind only examines and rearranges the impressions received from sense; carry the principle a little further, and we must maintain that all we know of an external world is these impressions — the external world is, in fact, nothing but these impressions, and this of course implies a denial that any such thing as substance is known at all. Here again is exaggerated individualism — the reduction of all knowledge to the knowledge of particulars. This individualism, applied to matter, makes things to be only thoughts; and Berkeley saves the unity of the external world, not by recognizing created substance in which qualities inhere, but by referring the impressions we receive directly to God the Creator. Hume justly thought it a poor rule that would not work both ways, and he applied the rule not only to matter but to mind. The same individualism which denies substance in the outer world must logically deny substance in the inner world; we need no soul within, any more than we need matter without; what we call soul is but a series of ideas — a string of beads without any string. Hume apparently did not see that the very first "impression" presupposes the existence of something to be impressed, that is, presupposes a soul within; just as the cognition of quality presupposes something to which the quality belongs, that is, presupposes material substance without. Yet Mill and Spencer have followed along this same line, and are equally with Hume sensational philosophers.

It is easy to see how the refusal to recognize the validity of the mind's intuitive cognition of substance should result in the loss of God as well as the loss of the soul. Kant maintained that things conform to cognition, not cognition to things. Things in themselves are unknown. Behind phenomena lies a world which human reason cannot penetrate. Compelled to think as we are, we can never know whether or not the reality corresponds to our thought. No wonder that Hegel rebelled against this agnosticism, and went to the opposite extreme of maintaining that the process of thought guaranteed its own validity; that thought, in fact, was existence, and existence was thought. Hence in his system we have the merging of reality in a thought-process; thought thinks; there is thinking without a thinker. There is no need of postulating any divine essence, any more than there is need of

postulating any substance for the world or for the soul. God becomes a universal, but impersonal, intelligence and will; an intelligence and will that come to consciousness only in man. It is only fair to say that will, even in man, never reaches a self-determination that can be called freedom; and intelligence in man never reaches a proper self-consciousness; for how can either of these be, where there is no real substantial self? Soul is not recognized as anything separate from the whole of which it forms a part, and of which it is the necessary manifestation. So idealism, aiming to save the life of thought, really loses it; refusing to recognize substance or essence, and confining itself to particulars, it finally gives up the individuality both of man and of God.

Not all idealists, however, carry the system to its logical conclusions. Many a modern theologian has adopted idealistic principles without consistently applying them. The doctrine of the immanence of God which forms so large an element in the New Theology has been derived from idealistic sources, and is distinctly Berkeleian and Hegelian in its spirit. The theology of Elisha Mulford, Theodore T. Munger, and Newman Smyth, is a theology which tends to make God in the human spirit the only cause. God and man are still recognized as personal, but the life of man is merged to a large extent in the life of God. Internal revelation is substituted for external; all men are conceived of as more or less inspired; the boundaries between the natural and the supernatural are broken down. Some recent writers* pride themselves on having discovered anew the thought which made the early church so devoted and yet so active — the thought that in God we live and move and have our being, and they ascribe the decline of Christianity to the fact that Augustine and Calvin lost sight of it, and looked upon God, after a deistic fashion, as a mechanical contriver of the universe and a worker upon it from without. As if some of the noblest utterances of this great truth of God's immanence had not proceeded from Augustine's and from Calvin's lips! † Let us give all proper emphasis to the truth of God's immanence; let us grant that it did not receive sufficient attention in the days of Butler and Paley; let us welcome the new light that is thrown upon it to-day. But, then, let us equally remember that God not only speaks with the still, small voice in the constitution of man and in the course of human history, but also by outward miracles of healing and resurrection, by the incarnation and death of his Son, and by the external revelations of Scripture. God's immanence is a vast truth; but we must not let it hide from our eyes the other truth of God's transcendence. He who is "in all," and "through all," is also "above all"; and, if he had not by miracle proved his transcendence, we probably should never have believed in his immanence.

It is mainly, however, through the identity-system of Jonathan Edwards that idealism has influenced the New Theology. To this identity-system, therefore, as its third source, I trace the movement in thought which I am considering.

There can be no doubt that Jonathan Edwards was an idealist. We do

*See Allen, *Continuity of Religious Thought*.

†See Augustine's *Confessions*, I : I.

not know that he ever met Berkeley, during the Bishop's stay in America, or that he ever read a work of Berkeley's, though Berkeley's *Principles of Human Knowledge* was published before Edwards's *Freedom of the Will.* It was probably through Dr. Samuel Johnson, Berkeley's American friend and disciple, and Jonathan Edwards's teacher at Yale College, that Edwards received his first bent to idealism.* The latter gives us his own statement of philosophical doctrine, as follows :

"When I say the material universe exists only in the mind, I mean that it is absolutely dependent on the conception of the mind for its existence ; and does not exist as spirits do, whose existence does not consist in, nor in dependence on, the conceptions of other minds. . . . All existence is mental . . . . the existence of all exterior things is ideal. . . . That which truly is the substance of all bodies is the infinitely exact and precise and perfectly stable idea in God's mind, together with his stable will that the same shall gradually be communicated to us, and to other minds, according to fixed and exact established methods and laws."

Jonathan Edwards was no traducian. Yet he was a believer in original sin, and held to such a unity of Adam's posterity with their first father as made them justly responsible for his first sin. This unity was constituted, not by the historical descent of the bodies and souls of Adam's posterity from the body and soul of Adam, but rather by the idea and will of God, which can make any two things to be identical. The radical error in his philosophy was his denial of substance. The past existence of the moon in the heavens is not the cause of its present existence — God's will is the cause ; preservation is a continuous creation ; every instant the moon is new-created by God. Similarly, Edwards had no thought of a common humanity, flowing by natural generation from Adam to us, and still less had he the idea of a realistic presence of the race in its first father. A union with Adam in acts and exercises is sufficient, and such a union exists by divine decree. The idea of this unity, in God's mind, itself constitutes the realty. Our sinful acts and exercises are Adam's, and Adam's acts and exercises are ours.

So Edwards held that God imputes Adam's sin to his posterity by arbitrarily identifying them with him — identity, on the theory of continuous creation, being only what God appoints. I do not mean that this is a complete account of Edwards's doctrine of sin. Since God's appointment did not furnish sufficient ground for imputation, Edwards joined the Placean doctrine to the other, and showed the justice of the condemnation by the fact that man is depraved. He added, moreover, the consideration that man ratifies this depravity by his own act. Thus he tried to combine three views. But all were vitiated by his doctrine of continuous creation, which logically made God the only cause in the universe, and left no freedom, guilt or responsibility to man. He thought too little of sin as a nature, and located responsibility too much in the acts and exercises which we put forth. It is no wonder that his followers repudiated his doctrine of the union of our acts and exercises with Adam's, and denied that sin is in any sense a nature. Baird, in his Elohim Revealed, has remarked that Edwards's idea that the character of an act is to be sought somewhere else than in its cause involves the fallacious assumption that acts have a subsistence and moral agency of their own, apart from that of the actor.

This divergence from the truth led to the exercise-system of Hopkins and

* Krauth, Berkeley's *Principles of Knowledge. Prolegomena*, pages 36 and 37.

Emmons, who not only denied moral character prior to individual choices, that is, denied sin of nature, but attributed all human acts and exercises to the direct efficiency of God. Hopkins declared: "All power is in God. This is the proper efficient cause of every event. All creatures which act or move, exist and move or are moved, by him."* Emmons said: "We cannot conceive that even omnipotence is able to form independent agents, because this would be to endow them with divinity. And since all men are dependent agents, all these motions, exercises, or actions must originate in a divine efficiency."† God therefore creates all the volitions of the soul, and effects by his almighty power all changes in the material world. According to this view, the contact of fire with the finger, the stroke of the axe on the tree, are only the occasions — divine omnipotence is the cause — of the tree's falling and the finger's burning. All causal connections between the different objects of the universe are at an end. No such things as physical forces exist. Nature becomes a mere phantom, and God is the only cause in the universe. It seems plain to me that this doctrine tends to pantheism. If all natural forces are merged in the one all-comprehending will of God, why should not the human will be merged in the will of God also? Why should not mind and matter alike be the phenomena of one force which has the attributes of both? Such a scheme makes supernatural religion impossible, for the reason that nature is denied, and everything — that is to say, nothing — becomes supernatural. How shall we save the sense of sin, if every sinful thought and impulse is the result of the divine efficiency? And, finally, how shall we save the character of God, if he is the direct author of moral evil?

It was such difficulties as these which led the main body of New England theologians to reject the exercise-system, with its attribution of all man's states and acts to the divine efficiency. But as they still followed Edwards in his rejection of substance or nature, the result was an almost unmitigated individualism. Smalley, Dwight and Woods were apparently conservative. N. W. Taylor best represents the tendencies of the system. He agreed with Hopkins and Emmons that there is no imputation of Adam's sin or of inborn depravity. He called that depravity physical, not moral. But he made all sin to be personal. He held to the power of contrary choice. Adam had it, and, contrary to the belief of Augustinians, he never lost it. Man "not only can if he will, but he can if he won't." He can, yet, without the Spirit, will not. Yet he did not hold to the Arminian liberty of indifference or contingence. He believed in the certainty of wrong action, yet in power to the contrary. "The error of Pelagius," he says, "was not in asserting that man *can* obey God without grace, but in saying that man does *actually* obey God without grace."‡ Dr. Park, of Andover, is understood to teach that the disordered state of the sensibilities and faculties with which we are born is the *immediate* occasion of sin, while Adam's transgression is the *remote* occasion of sin. The will, though influenced by an evil tendency, is still free; the evil tendency itself is not free, and therefore is not sin. This doctrine, though less radical than that of Dr. Taylor, is notwithstand-

* Hopkins, *Works*, 1:164–167.
† Emmons, *Works*, 4:381.
Moral Government, 2:132.

ing at a vast remove from that of Jonathan Edwards. Here is no union of nature, or union of act, with Adam ; no imputation of Adam's sin or of our hereditary depravity. On the whole, the history of New England theology shows a tendency to emphasize less and less the depraved tendencies prior to actual sin, and to maintain that moral character begins only with individual choice,— most of the New England theologians, however, holding that this individual choice begins at birth.

If the reader has followed me thus far, he will be able to recognize in the New Theology many of the traits I have been describing, and to trace them to their sources. Nominalism treats human nature as a mere name. Idealism regards substance as non-existent. The identity-system makes acts and exercises the be-all and end-all of our moral life. All these are features of an exaggerated individualism ; and of this, as I said at the beginning, the New Theology is the latest and most popular theological expression. That this is so will be more fully apparent, if I mention now certain of its more specific ideas. I propose to characterize them in each case by a catch-word, more or less descriptive. I do this mainly for the sake of clearness, and as a sort of mnemonic ; I would therefore have the catch-word interpreted by the following text, rather than have the text interpreted by the catch-word.

The first specific idea of the new theology, then, is that of the Christian consciousness. The new method of thought, while not formally setting aside the Scriptures or assigning to them an inferior authority, sets side by side with them another standard of faith and practice, namely, the intuitions and experience of the believer. It connects itself very naturally with what we may call the illumination-theory of inspiration, which regards inspiration as merely an intensifying and elevating of the religious perceptions of the Christian, the same in kind, though greater in degree, with the illumination of every believer by the Holy Spirit ; and which holds, not that the Bible is, but that it contains the word of God — not the writings, but only the writers being inspired. Those who hold to this general form of doctrine, as they bring inspiration *down* to a lower level, would correspondingly bring illumination *up*, so that both shall walk upon the same plane. It is the idealistic scheme of which we have already spoken. It depreciates the outward revelation, with the intent of exalting the inward. The spirit of scientific unity seems to constrain it ; since there is undoubtedly *something* of the nature of inward revelation, *all* revelation must of necessity be inward. Christian consciousness becomes the only medium of receiving religious truth. The intuitions of the Christian are the final test. And so we have Christian preachers declaring that they will preach no doctrines which they have not realized in their own experience, and private Christians asserting that what they cannot understand they will not believe. Neither these preachers, nor these Christians, seem to perceive that they are acting upon the essential principle of rationalism, and that, so far as they act upon it, they are not believers at all. If I will accept nothing and preach nothing but what my reason can demonstrate and my intellect comprehend, why call myself a Christian? As Lessing said so well : "What is the use of a revelation that reveals nothing?"

We get good from the Scriptures, only in proportion as we understand

them. But we are not, for that reason, to keep back from men the Scriptures which we do not understand — others may understand the truth we speak, better than we do. We have an objective message and communication from God, and this it is our business as ambassadors to deliver, whether men will hear, or whether they will forbear. The Old Testament prophets were not absolved from the duty of publishing God's word, although they themselves searched "what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them." And New Testament prophets are under equal obligation to "declare the whole counsel of God," in spite of their own personal ignorance of its full meaning. We get the good of truth only by understanding it, and we understand it only as the Holy Spirit takes of the things of Christ and shows them to us. Yet we are to accept the truth, and to publish the truth, whether we understand it or not.

What, now, is the relation of Christian consciousness to the Scriptures? Or, to put the same question in different form: How far, and in what sense, are the experience and judgment of the Christian to be trusted, where Scripture is either ambiguous or silent? It seems to me that the very word "consciousness," which plays so important a part in this discussion, might teach a good lesson to the advocates of the New Theology. Consciousness, like conscience, is an accompanying knowledge. As those who would make conscience legislative, or would give to it original authority, are untrue to the meaning of the word itself, which intimates that conscience subsumes particular acts or states under a standard previously accepted from some other source, and judges them by or in connection with that standard, so consciousness is a con-knowing; in mental philosophy, a knowing of my own acts or states, in connection with my knowledge of self; in the matter we are discussing, a knowing of doctrine or duty, in connection with the permanent standard given us in Scripture.

Consciousness is in no case a new or collateral source of truth. Experience is only a testing or trying of truth already revealed. Intuition is not creative; it only recognizes objective realities that were already there to be recognized. And so all these words, loosely employed as they frequently are, should be kept to their primary meaning. The Christian consciousness is a con-knowing of the things of God, in connection with and by means of his written word. It is not a *norma normans*, but a *norma normata;* and this it must ever be, at least in our present state, for the reason that sin yet remains to blind us. The spiritual perception of the Christian is always rendered to some extent imperfect and deceptive by remaining depravity. "The ethico-religious consciousness" is by itself utterly untrustworthy; it must ever be rectified, as the judgments of conscience are to be rectified, by comparison with express divine revelation; where revelation speaks, there Christian consciousness may safely speak; where that is silent, the latter must be silent: "To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them."

Equally plain is it that nothing which we know of the work of the Holy Spirit warrants the attribution to the Christian consciousness of authority aside from or co-ordinate with that of Scripture. Despite the claims of

advocates of "the inner light," from George Fox to the latest enthusiast, it still remains true that the Holy Spirit works only by showing us the word; the "sword" or instrument of the Spirit is "the word of God." The Holy Spirit takes of the "things of Christ," "brings them to remembrance," unfolds the truth "as it is in Jesus." All this indicates not a new, but the revival of a past, revelation; not the providing of a new reservoir, but distribution from a reservoir already filled; not communication of new truth, but illumination of the mind to perceive the meaning of truth revealed already. So the Holy Spirit merely turns the outer word into an inner word, and makes its truth and power manifest to the heart. Any other doctrine than this is covert mysticism — new communications from God, aside from, or co-ordinate with, those embodied in the Scriptures. We can no more make theology without Scripture, than the Israelites in Egypt could make bricks without straw.

The New Theology, in emphasizing the fact of the Holy Spirit's work within, is bringing into needed prominence a fact which has been too much neglected. Thus far I hope for good results from this movement of thought, and rejoice that the third person of the blessed Trinity is recognized as the author of all internal revelation. But all new movements in thought tend to extremes. I fear that the animating principle of the new movement is not so much zeal for the Holy Spirit's work as it is disinclination to recognize the outward revelation of God, which the Holy Spirit's work presupposes; and therefore that the tendency of it will be not so much to mysticism as to naturalism and rationalism. Let us ever remember that, as man can reveal himself by works and words, so can God. Internal revelation proceeds only upon the basis of external revelation; it presupposes external revelation; reflects, confirms, and establishes it. As the Holy Spirit is the organ of internal, so Christ is the organ of external, revelation. We must not exaggerate the work of the Holy Spirit, for that is to depreciate the work of Christ. We must not overstate the internal evidence for Christianity, for that is to discredit miracles and the supernatural generally. We must not insist on the immanence of God, to the exclusion of the transcendence. And yet all these errors the New Theology is in danger of committing when it elevates Christian consciousness into a source, however subordinate, of Christian doctrine. The moment we exalt Christian experience into an authority, we undermine the Scriptures which constitute the only safe foundation for Christian experience. The logical result will sooner or later be the teaching that the only inspiration is Christian experience, and that all Christian experience is inspiration. We shall then cherish a thousand blind hopes for which revelation furnishes no solid basis; but with these hopes will come a thousand vagaries of doctrine, and finally both the vagaries and the hopes will be succeeded by the uncertainty, the unbelief, and the despair, into which an unbridled rationalism plunges the soul.

There is a second specific idea of the New Theology which I must now mention. It has to do with the person and work of the second person of the Trinity, as the last had to do with the person and work of the third person of the Trinity. I know of no phrase that better expresses the idea than that of the extra-temporal Christ. Of course there is an antithesis intended here. The extra-temporal Christ is not the Christ of our earthly history,

but the Christ who is beyond present time and space ; the eternal Logos who upholds all things, while at the same time he exists beyond them. Here, too, we must acknowledge that a great truth — a truth often ignored — is brought out and emphasized. Christ is "the Lamb slain from before the foundation of the world." "In him all things consist." He is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." The whole physical universe is dependent upon Christ; but it is equally true that the intellectual and moral world is dependent on him also ; he is "the light that lighteth every man." Let us thank the New Theology for recalling theological thought to this truth. But with its inculcation of this truth there goes too often a tendency to forget that the historical manifestation of Christ is in the Scriptures declared to be the only ground of hope for sinners, and it is this tendency which we must criticise and reprehend.

Let me make plain this objection to the New Theology. It substitutes an extra-temporal Christ for the Christ of historic fact, and bases its hopes rather upon Christ's ideal and essential nature than upon his actual manifestation in humanity. In this I seem to see the influence of Schleiermacher, in whom idealism found its champion, and through whom idealism has infected the religious thinking of Germany. Schleiermacher had little confidence in Christianity as an external and historical fact ; even the incarnation and resurrection of Christ, as literal events, he discredited, by calling them unnecessary to the vindication of our faith ; the Christ within seemed to him much more important than the Christ without; Christian feelings and not outward facts were made to be the real sources of theology. Schleiermacher did noble service in bridging over the gulf between the old rationalism and the new evangelical faith. He "builded better than he knew," when he declared that Christianity could rest its argument upon the facts of the inner life of the believer. But, as has been well said, he was another Lazarus ; he came forth with the grave-clothes of a pantheistic philosophy entangling his steps. He did not see that the loftier the structure of Christian life and doctrine, the greater the need that its foundation be secure ; and that the authority of Christ as a teacher of supernatural truth rests upon his miracles, and specially upon the miracle of his resurrection. The inward wonders of the Christian life will not long impress men, if the historical facts of Jesus' incarnation and resurrection are denied. These inward wonders, like the outward miracles, will be attributed to merely natural causes, and Christianity will be counted only the pleasing dream of the enthusiast.

As with Jesus' life and teaching, so with his atonement ; the New Theology tends to substitute the inward for the outward. It has accepted very fully the idea that there is no principle in the divine nature that needs to be propitiated. It is man, not God, who needs to be reconciled. The atonement is subjective, not objective. It has effect, not to satisfy divine justice, but so to reveal divine love as to soften human hearts and lead them to repentance ; in other words, Christ's sufferings were necessary, not in order to remove an obstacle to the pardon of sinners which exists in the mind of God, but in order to convince sinners that there exists no such obstacle. We see here again the nominalistic element. Righteousness in God is no distinct attribute ; it is a mere name for benevolence. Hence Dr. Bushnell's view that an internal change in man himself is all that is needful ; hence Dr. Park's

view that the cross is not an execution of justice, but only an exhibition of justice — a scenic representation of God's regard for law, which will make it safe for his government to pardon the violators of law. All this makes the atonement histrionic instead of real, converts it from an objective into a subjective fact, and transfers its place from the court of God's justice to the secret heart of the believer. In short, the theory exalts the Christ in us at the expense of the Christ outside of us, and does this in respect to the atonement just as much as it had previously done in respect to revelation in general.

There is an error here so subtle, and yet so fundamental, that we may do well carefully to consider it. It is the error of supposing that because outward revelation and atonement are limited by the conditions of space and time, they cannot have in them any infinite or absolute element, and therefore we must look beyond them for something larger and more spiritual. It is of a piece with the mistake of Philip. Philip would have looked beyond the present historic Christ in order to find the Father. But Jesus' words were a sufficient correction of his error: "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, show us the Father?" Do we desire an ideal and spiritual Christ? We shall find him only in the crucified and risen Redeemer. In him is "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily," that is, in bodily form. The Christ of history divinely expresses the eternal Logos, nay, the very mind and heart of the whole Godhead; for "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." The outward atonement has compressed into it the whole compass and meaning of redemption — God's love, in union with humanity, offering itself as a sacrifice to God's holiness, outraged by human sin. Human symbols only partially express the truth they are intended to convey; divine symbols express the whole — nay, they are the truth and the fact itself, put into the forms of sense and time. Do we wish to know more about the meaning of the outward word? Then let us not add to it our human speculations; let us only study more closely what the word itself declares. Do we desire to know more about what Christ will do beyond this present earthly sphere? Then let us study anew his historical manifestation; for the historical Christ is the extra-temporal Christ manifested. Eternity will only unfold the truth which we already possess in germ. As omnipresence is the presence of the whole of God in every place, so, in the revelation of God in Christ which we have already, we possess the substance of God's eternal truth.

The third and last specific idea of the New Theology may be characterized as that of a second probation. I am aware that the phrase will not be accepted by many of the advocates of the views I am examining, and I grant that it needs qualification. The probation for which they contend is not, they say, a second probation, since those who undergo it have never had, prior to that, any proper probation at all. It is not claimed that a future probation is enjoyed by all, but only that it is enjoyed by those who have had no opportunity here to learn of the historic Christ. I must be allowed to say, however, that the probation claimed is fairly called a second probation, if only those to whom it is granted are moral creatures here; for a moral creature here, under only the providential government of God and with the mere

light of conscience within, is being tested and tried in character. Whether this probation is a proper probation, is really the question at issue. The advocates of the New Theology declare that for multitudes it is not a proper probation. They say that for the heathen, as well as for infants, the opportunity to decide for or against Christ, since it is not given here, must be given hereafter. The immutable God must deal alike with all. Since Christ has died for all, all must have a chance to accept him as a Savior. For some at least, the work of the Holy Spirit must be done the other side of death. To some, Christ is offered as a Savior in the next world, rather than in this.

I wish to point out first of all that this view is but a corollary of the nominalistic individualism, which I described in an earlier portion of this essay. The view rests upon an atomistic conception of the race as a mere collection of units. It can be successfully met, only by those who accept the Scriptural doctrine of the organic unity of humanity and its common fall in Adam. New School theology cannot erect any sufficient barrier against it. It cannot find what it regards as a fair and sufficient probation for each individual since the first sin ; and the conclusion is easy, that there must be such a fair probation for each individual in the world to come. So New School theology inevitably becomes New Theology, and only illustrates the ultimate results of evil that flow from what at first seemed an unimportant deviation from Scriptural doctrines. Let us advise those who take this view to return to the old theology. Grant a fair probation for the whole race already passed, and the condition of mankind is no longer that of mere unfortunates unjustly circumstanced, but rather that of beings guilty and condemned, to whom present opportunity, and even present existence, is matter of pure grace, — much more the general provision of a salvation, and the offer of it to any human soul. To put my thought yet more clearly : This world is already a place of second probation ; and, since this second probation is due wholly to God's mercy, no probation after death is needed to vindicate either the justice or the goodness of God. Since one probation of the race was passed before our conscious experience began, since our present individual life is already a second probation and is wholly a matter of grace, it is presumption itself for any human being to demand in the future life still another and a third probation.

But aside from a denial of a common probation and fall in our first father, which the New Theology involves, it commits the yet more palpable error of denying the universal guilt of mankind. I do not mean that this guilt is formally denied, but that it is so explained as to make it equivalent to mere misfortune or disease, and to absolve it from all obligation to suffer punishment. Of course no advocate of the New Theology is a believer in the guilt of inborn depravity. Denial of our oneness with Adam in the first transgression carries with it a denial of responsibility for the direct consequences of that transgression. Sin consists in sinning, says the New Theology ; and by sinning it means only individual and personal transgression. The vast number of those who never in this world come to conscious moral life can have no sin or guilt to be atoned for ; they need no Christ, and, if they enter heaven at all, they enter it by right of native innocence. Sinful dispositions are sinful, not because they *are* sin, but because they *lead* to sin. And,

since God takes into consideration the degree of light which men enjoy, those who in heathen lands are destitute of knowledge of the gospel are supposed to be in much the same condition as infants or idiots, and it is said of them that "where there is no law, there is no transgression." So our conviction of the guilt of the heathen is weakened, and it is held to be unjust in God to punish them, — at least until after they have heard of Christ and have consciously rejected him.

Here is the weakness of Dorner's Eschatology, from which, as from an armory, many of the offensive weapons of the New Theology are drawn. Dorner began his great work on Christian doctrine with a just and profound view of sin, as unlikeness to God and self-determination of the will against him. But in the Eschatology this view is exchanged for another which practically ignores the element of guilt, and makes the sinner a mere creature, with just claims to God's pity. All this falls in with the pantheistic tendency of our time to regard sin as a natural necessity, instead of being, as it is, the wilful revolt of the free will from God. Let us take our stand upon that law of God which is a reflection of his holiness and is identical with the constituent principles of being; that law which demands absolute perfection in thought, desire, word, deed, aye, even in the very substance of the soul; that law which declares all falling short of this standard as sin and guilt, deserving not pardon but punishment. The heathen can claim nothing from God; the Scripture expressly declares that they are "by nature children of wrath." God is under no obligation to them. They are guilty by birth, and guilty by overt transgression. Not one of them has a claim to grace in this present world; much less has he a claim to grace in the world to come. Does the New Theology believe that the heathen are guilty? if so, let it cease to argue that the justice of God requires that they should have a chance to accept salvation, either here or hereafter.

The fact that Christ, as eternal Logos, exists beyond the bounds of his historic work is often urged to break the force of this argument from the guilt of the heathen. But let us remember that this manifestation of Christ is granted to the heathen even here and now. As he is "the light that lighteth every man," all natural conscience and all religious ideas, so far as they have truth in them, are derived from him. Before his advent in the flesh, patriarchs were saved by believing in him, and the antediluvian world was condemned for rejecting him; for, whether in believing or rejecting, they had to do with him who is the only revealer of God, of whom, and through whom, are all things. God did not even then leave himself, he does not now leave himself, without a witness. The heathen are without excuse, because "that which is known of God is manifest among them." Missionaries find everywhere the knowledge of law; there is a universal sense of sin; every man in some way violates conscience, and feels justly condemned. The New Theology speaks of a supra-historic Christ, and prides itself on emphasizing his inward work in human hearts. Let it recognize the fact that Christ is already doing a supra-historic work; that the revelation of nature is itself a revelation of Christ; that men do not need to see the cross on which he died, in order to reject him. In short, in this great controversy between God and the sinning children of men, let us put ourselves upon the side of God and not upon the side of his enemies. Let us declare God to be true, though we have to call every man a liar.

If men may accept Christ or reject him, even without knowing of his historical manifestation in the flesh, what limits can we put to his work of mercy? We put no limits but those which his word declares. The patriarchs, though they had no knowledge of a personal Christ, were saved by believing in God so far as God had revealed himself to them; and whoever among the heathen are saved must in like manner be saved by casting themselves as helpless sinners upon God's plan of mercy, dimly shadowed forth in nature and providence. But such faith, even among the patriarchs and heathen, is implicitly a faith in Christ, and would become explicit and conscious trust and submission, whenever the historic Christ were made known to them. Christ is the word of God and the truth of God; he may therefore be received even by those who have not heard of his manifestation in the flesh; we may hope that "many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." For "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is acceptable to him." A proud and self-righteous morality is inconsistent with salvation; but a penitent and humble reliance upon God as a Savior from sin and a guide of conduct is an implicit faith in Christ; for such reliance casts itself upon God so far as God has revealed himself, and the only revealer of God is Christ. But as the Scriptures intimate that men may be saved by an implicit trust in Christ, so they equally intimate that men may be lost by only implicitly rejecting him. As men can be saved by casting themselves as sinners upon the mercy of a Christ whose very name they do not know, so they can be lost by transgressing the law and resisting the drawings of that same Christ who speaks to them only in nature, in conscience, and in providence. How long his Spirit will strive with man, and when the day of his grace shall end, reason cannot inform us; the objective word is the only source of knowledge. Since his atonement is a matter of grace, not of justice, it can be applied when and where he pleases. Only he can tell us upon what terms, and for how long, men can obtain salvation. And what saith the Scripture? Does it hold out the hope that after death, for the heathen or for any others, there may still be opportunities of faith and pardon? On the other hand, we have the declarations that "they that sin without law shall perish without law;" we shall all be "manifest before the judgment seat of Christ"—not that each may have new opportunity for salvation, but "that each may receive the things done in the body." Of the wicked, it is said that their "end is to be burned." "It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this," not a new probation, but "judgment." In the next world, between the righteous and the wicked there is "a great gulf fixed," impassable to both. "They that have done ill" shall come forth from their graves, not to undergo a new probation, but "unto the resurrection of judgment." All these Scripture passages indicate finality in the decisions of this present life; and for this reason Protestant churches have never thought it right to pray for the dead. We know that conversion and renewal are the work of the Holy Spirit; but we have no Scripture evidence that the influences of the Spirit are exerted, after death, upon the still impenitent; there is abundant evidence, on the contrary, that the moral condition in which death finds men is their condition forever.

I began my article by calling the New Theology a theology of exaggerated individualism. I have spoken of its historical connections, and have traced it back to nominalism, idealism, and the identity-system of Jonathan Edwards. I have noted and criticized the most prominent specific ideas of the New Theology, namely, the Christian consciousness, the extra-temporal Christ, and the future probation of those who have not in this life had the gospel preached to them. But there are certain practical results to be apprehended from this tendency in the theological world, which, as the application of my subject, I feel compelled, finally, though very summarily, to mention. The theology of exaggerated individualism, will, in my judgment, do much to accelerate that deterioration of family life which has often been pointed out as a sign that Christianity is losing its hold upon the nation. The individualistic theory of the family is an outgrowth of the individualistic theory of the race. To great masses of our population marriage is but a civil contract, which, so far as the mere right of the thing is concerned, is dissoluble at pleasure. After marriage, as before marriage, the parties are two, not one; the merging of the two into each other, the constitution of a new organic unity — in short, the very idea of the family bond — is absent; the individual is still a law unto himself, instead of being under law to another. Hence the frequent discord which invades the family, and the increasing prevalence of divorce. The same exaggerated individualism appears in the labor-strifes of our day. Every man is for himself, whether he be capitalist or workman. Each thinks of his rights, but thinks much less of his duties. The idea of the organic unity of society, of merging personal interests in the interests of the whole, of thinking not simply of his own things but of the things of others also, this idea is fast dying out. We need to revive and reinforce it by the inculcation of human unity and brotherhood. The Scriptures furnish us with our doctrine. The family is one; society is one; the nation is one; the race is one. Because one blood flows in our veins and we have one divine Father, we are members one of another.

In the life of the church this principle is more important still, and forgetfulness of it brings results yet more pernicious. There is a vital union with the Redeemer which joins all Christians to one another. In connecting themselves with Christ they become members of a mighty organism pervaded with the common life of the Head. In a true sense the Christian ceases to be an individual, and merges himself in the body; he can say: "For me to live is Christ;" "no longer live I, but Christ liveth in me." And yet how plain it is, that to many Christians there never yet has come this sense of the real meaning of their relation to Christ, and to his body, the church. An exaggerated individualism yet rules them. They have no conception of the church as an organism which derives its life from Christ, a living unity into which they have merged themselves. They have no sense of the dignity of their position, as belonging to Christ's body, or as responsible for the condition of the whole. "Am I my brother's keeper?" is still their cry. Surely nothing is so much needed in our church-life as the substitution of the instinct of unity for the spirit of isolation and division. And what better recipe can be given than the inculcation of the Scripture doctrine of union with Christ? But that doctrine cannot be taken by itself. Side by side with it is the other doctrine of union with Adam. As justifica-

tion comes to all who receive their spiritual life from Christ, so condemnation comes to all who receive their natural life from Adam. And so the highest conception of the Christian life, and the highest efficiency of the Christian church, are inseparably bound up with the acceptance of the old doctrine of the organic unity of the race and its common fall in the person of its first father.

This subject has a special relation to the ministry and to missions. It has been felt of late that there was a great falling off in the number of recruits; that the disposition to enter the ministry was waning; that there was no sufficient impulse to prosecute the work. I venture to suggest a reason for this. Christian people are losing out of their thoughts the idea of oneness with the race; and young men are no longer pressed with the conviction that, as a part of this common humanity, they are bound to do all they can to save it. We are bound to love our neighbor as ourselves, because our neighbor is ourselves. It was because Christ was one with us that he was bound to die. In order to revive the sense of obligation to preach the gospel, we need first to inculcate the organic unity of the race. And what is true of ministers is true of the church at large. The only sufficient incentive to missionary effort is that sense of unity which Christ's teaching and example are calculated to inspire. All that separates the heathen from us, or makes their fate dependent upon the decisions of another world, is a hindrance to missions. We must feel ourselves the brothers of all, and we must feel that their fate is in our hands, if we are ever to put forth the effort necessary to their conversion. Only upon the view that Paul regarded the heathen as lost if they did not in this life learn of Christ and accept him, can we explain his consuming missionary zeal. Only upon the view that "the heathen perish day by day," can we explain the communication of Paul's spirit to the missionaries of modern times. If the salvation of the heathen practically depends upon the prayers and gifts and labors of the church, we may hope yet to see Christendom pouring into heathen lands its men and its treasure, in order to bring the nations to the faith of Jesus Christ. But if the heathen are not shut up to this life as their only time of mercy, if a vast future of larger opportunity opens to them beyond death, not only will the Christian world cease to feel their guilt, but it will cease to feel their danger. "The nerve of missionary enterprise will be cut," and the day of Christ's triumph will be postponed, until there rises a new generation with deeper convictions of the sinfulness of sin, and with deeper compassion for the millions that yearly perish for lack of knowledge.

The New Theology exaggerates the principle of individualism, and thinks that it gains thereby a nobler view of man. But it looks only at the individual man; of humanity as a whole, fallen in Adam and sunk in a common guilt, it has no conception; hence it can never rise to the sublime conception of a common redemption in Christ and of the common dependence of the race upon the one historical Savior. It needs the idea of man as man, to lift it out of doctrinal inconsistency and practical inefficiency. Not only theoretical considerations but observed effects argue that the well-worn path is the path of safety — *via trita, via tuta.* We have no need of the New Theology, for the old is better.

XIII.

THE LIVING GOD.*

Many of you have been struck with the frequent recurrence in Scripture of the phrase "the living God." If you look carefully you will find this designation in all parts of the Bible, from the Pentateuch, where Israel is said to have "heard the voice of the living God" speaking from Mount Sinai, to the Revelation, where the flying angel is said to "have the seal of the living God," and God is spoken of as "he that sitteth upon the throne, who liveth forever and ever." This recognition of God as "the living God" is combined with the mention of all his other attributes and works, and these acquire new lustre from the association, while they in turn reflect light upon the meaning of the phrase with which they are combined. The text explains what I mean. There the fact that God is the one only and true God, and that he exercises from everlasting to everlasting the attributes of kingship, shows that the life of God is an all-originating and all-controlling life, shows in fine that it is life in the highest sense. We need not wonder at finding this lofty view of the divine Being so plainly declared, nor at finding the conception of God as the living God underlying the whole Scripture. The very purpose for which the Hebrew nation existed was to root deeply in human consciousness this idea of the one living and true God. And how deeply it was rooted is shown by the fact that among the Jews all natural forces came to be looked upon as directly under God's hand, and as manifesting his will, so that the Psalmist, in his description of the storm, leaves out all mention of secondary causes, and says in so many words, "The God of glory thundereth." So completely were the apostles delivered from all conception of God as a dead abstraction, or as capable of a rival, that they almost by instinct besought the worshippers of idols to "turn from these vanities unto the living God." If we have in any degree lost sight of this truth, we need to get back to it, for a mistake here will vitiate our whole view of Christian doctrine, and may work incalculable injury in our actual lives. Let us first inquire what it means to say that God is the living God, and secondly, what this conception of God involves by way of consequence.

First, the meaning of it: Life, in God, must mean much more than it does in man — must mean nothing less than an *all-originating and all-sustaining life.* Man, in a sense, has life and gives life; but he knows that what life he has is not originated by himself, but has come to him apart from his own knowledge or will. His reason compels him to infer the existence of another life from which his own originally sprang. He knows that he does not sustain his own life from day to day. The machinery of his frame works

* Originally prepared as a sermon upon the text, Jer. 10: 10—"The Lord is the true God; he is the living God, and an everlasting king."

on even in his sleep,— some other life keeps all things moving. Indeed, all the life of nature, not originating itself, and not able to account for itself, must be referred back to some higher life that originates and preserves it. And this life in which all other life is grounded, great as it is, and beyond all our efforts to comprehend it, belongs to God. Our first conception of him is that of one who not only has life, but who has it in overflowing fullness, so that he is the source and principle of all other life which the universe contains. This is the main thought of the 104th Psalm. With a little alteration, I may use the following words of a noted interpreter : "You find there, more than in any other ancient poetry, the distinct recognition of the absolute dependence of the universe, as created, upon the Creator. 'He is before all things, and by him all things subsist.' But this is not all. God's work is not regarded as a thing of the past merely,— the universe is not a machine once set going and then left to its fate or to inexorable laws. The great Worker is ever working. The world and all things owe not only their origin but their present form to the operation of God. He who made, renews, the face of the earth. It is the same profound view of the relation of the cosmos to the Creator which Paul exhibits in his speech on Mars' Hill. He too is careful not to separate the past from the present. God, who made the world in the past, did not leave the work of his fingers : the streaming forth of his omnipotence and love was not checked or stayed; on the contrary, every part of his creation rests at every moment on his hands, 'seeing he giveth' continually, 'to all, life and breath and all things.'" God then is the living God, as being the soul which animates a universe that would be dead without him.

And yet some who have maintained this truth most earnestly, have declared that this principle of universal life is itself unintelligent and unconscious, and that the great life of the universe comes to consciousness only in individuals, whether of this or other races. In opposition to this the Scriptures maintain again that this life of God is *a life of the spirit, conscious, intelligent, self-determining, free ;* acting in infinite wisdom for infinitely worthy ends ; and displaying in all its acts the glory of a perfect character — a character of holiness and love. If we do not admit this to be a true representation of God, we put God below man — the Creator below the creature. Indeed we cannot account for man at all, or for the wonderful adaptations of the universe. There are marks of intelligent design everywhere. Means are fitted to ends. The God who so fitted and adapted one part of his creation to another must be a God of intelligence and purpose and benevolent impulse. There must be a thinking and willing above us, separate from the thinking and willing of the creature, — or else the creature could never have been made to think and will. Nothing can produce what is above itself,— the offspring of the beast is only a beast, not a man. All the universe, if there were no life in it but that of blind natural forces, could not produce anything that was not blind and unintelligent like itself. But man on the other hand, being gifted with the power of thought and will, instinctively reasons that the power that gave him being must think and will also ; otherwise there is no adequate cause for his existence. And David puts the argument in poetic yet unanswerable form when he asks : "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see? He that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?"

And so our reason drives us to the belief in God as a *personal* Being — distinct from his works and exalted above his works, even while he is moving all the wheels of his great system. And, as man's personality implies a conscious intelligence, a self-determining will, a character, an end, so applying these same ideas to God, when raised to their highest power, we see in God a consciousness that embraces at the same moment all things in the universe and in himself; a will that ordains either directly or by permission all existences and events; a character that makes every thought and determination infinitely benevolent and holy; an end in creation and in his own existence infinitely worthy of himself. But what is the deepest and most central idea of this personal life? I answer, it is the idea of *will* — will exercised in all things in infinite freedom and infinite power. Ask yourself what it is that most contributes to make you a living soul, and you find it is your freedom, your power under certain limitations to become an originating cause. If man were a mere machine, moved by forces entirely external to himself, he would not be man,— he would not call himself alive. But this will within us, which forms decisions, chooses ends, leaps forward towards the objects of its choice, and guides all the enginery of the nature onward with it to the goal, this is our great heritage, this gives us all the substantial existence we have, this constitutes our dignity in the creation. The plant or the brute acts only as it is acted upon; it chooses no end for which to work; it has no spontaneity of life. But man stands nearest God by virtue of this faculty which in a certain sense creates, bringing forth new thoughts, desires, and acts, and exerting a force which is felt in its last vibrations in every part of the universe and by God himself.

And yet, as I just said, man exerts this living force only under limitations. External circumstances confine him. His own nature binds him. How he came to be what he is, he does not know; and he can alter himself as little as he can make over again the outward world. And so this will-power which man exerts, and which constitutes the essence of his life, only feebly reflects the energy of will that exists in God. What must this will be, that constitutes the central principle of God's personality — that makes him in deed and in truth the living God? You can see at once that his will has no external restrictions. "None can stay his hand, and say 'what doest thou?'" You can see that, will being essential to his personality, he does nothing without a will — no blind action — no unconscious action like that of our sleep and our dreams, but wherever God works through the universe — and he works everywhere — he works in all his personality, works as a living, conscious, moral agent, works with perfect freedom the present decrees of an infinite will.

It must be remembered, too, that as the life of God is a self-existent life, so it is *sufficient to itself*. God does not need the universe, nor any creature, to supplement his existence or render him more happy. He is the ever-blessed God because, independently of the things he has made, he possesses infinite resources of knowledge and communion and joy in his own holy nature. And these are secured to God forever by the fact that in his nature there are distinctions which are revealed to us under the figure of persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Before the world was, these existed, so that God in himself had objects of contemplation and of love from eternity —

objects infinitely surpassing his after creation, in magnificence and glory. God is the living God, because his life is an absolutely independent and self-sufficient life. And so all his acts and forth-puttings of power, whether in creation or in providence or in redemption, are free acts, dictated not by necessity but by pure disinterested love. Any other conception than this denies in effect that he is the living God. If there be anything in him which compels him to create or to reveal himself, then he ceases to be free. And the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is the most rational of all doctrines, because only by it can the independence of God, or in other words his Godhood, be maintained. The Unitarian view of the absolute simplicity of the divine nature leaves God without an object, without love, without communion, unless he finds it in the world. Eternity past, on this theory, must be an eternity of desolation ; and, to escape this conclusion, many a Unitarian thinker is driven to believe in the eternity of matter and so to put side by side with God an eternal something which he did not originate, and which determines and limits him. This is to destroy his Deity altogether. And the only refuge from this is the Pantheistic conception of God and nature as one, and of an unintelligent, half-material God that comes to life and consciousness only in individual minds. And, that Unitarianism tends to Pantheism and the denial of all real life in God, is abundantly shown by the history of Mohammedanism and modern Judaism on the one hand, and on the other by the rapid downward progress of New England thought from the cautious Unitarianism of Channing to the half-fledged Pantheism of Theodore Parker and the full-fledged Pantheism of Ralph Waldo Emerson. How much better than all this, how much more rational and how much more safe the Scriptural view of a trinity of persons in the divine nature — a view which maintains the absolute perfection of God by declaring his eternal independence and self-sufficiency — a view which recognizes in him a fullness of resources that needs no creature and no universe to render it more complete, that provides eternal and infinite objects of contemplation and the means of perfect love and fellowship without going outside of his own nature, and that shows how the eternal existence of these objects of regard can never hamper or limit him, because they are not created objects, but the Son and the Holy Ghost, the equal partakers of his essence and the sharers of his throne.

Thus, I have attempted to explain the meaning of the phrase "the living God," and have shown that it involves the ideas, first, of an all-originating and sustaining life, in opposition to the views of the Deist who would banish God from the universe he has made and set a-going ; secondly, of a consciously voluntary life, in opposition to the views of the Pantheist who would entomb God in the great machine and confound him with it ; thirdly, of an eternally independent and self-sufficient life, in opposition to the views of the Unitarian, who would deny the distinction of persons in the Godhead and logically destroy his Deity by making him dependent upon his creation. If you have followed me thus far, you will appreciate two most important and valuable results which flow from this conception of God as the living God. And the first is, that it utterly delivers us from the tyranny of the modern idea of law, which so weakens the faith and oppresses the hearts of many believers. I say the tyranny of the modern idea of law,

and by this I mean the overstraining of the idea so that it encompasses and swallows up all things — the universe, freedom, and God himself. How many there are who begin to doubt whether the dominion of fixed law leaves any room for miracles, for answers to prayer, for pardoning grace, for regenerating power! Now I think it is easy to see, after what has been said, that these doubts all rest upon a mistaken notion of the nature of law and of its relation to God. Far be it from me to decry the true idea of "the reign of law" which constitutes the strength and inspiration of modern science. I stand for it. I rejoice in it as almost a new revelation of the perfections of God himself. But on that very account I am unwilling to sacrifice that which is its greatest glory — its connection with the unseen worker who manifests himself through it. To deify law, and put it in place of God,— that is to unmake it, to destroy it. To imagine some blind, unconscious force shaping all things into forms of beauty and regulating all the changes of nature and of history,— that is to put ourselves under the awful sceptre of fate, and to turn law into a hideous monstrosity. And from this conception, the revelation of God as the living God delivers us. If he is the all-originating, all-sustaining, all-controlling One, and no force is exerted in the universe without his permission and superintendence, then law assumes a different aspect to us. The laws of nature and the laws of the Spirit are all manifestations of the harmony of his nature and the power of his will. His laws are fixed because his will is infinitely wise and so infinitely unchanging,— and the regular sequences of nature are but the orderly methods of his operation. What is law? Can you give any better definition of it than this — a steady will enforced by power? Can you define the phrase "laws of nature" any better than by saying that they are the manifestations of a present God, enforcing an infinitely wise and changeless will by the exercise of infinite power? See then how all these laws which we are tempted to look upon as dead material things are revelations of a personal will, a present upholder and mover, in other words, a living God! However closely these laws may press me or cross me, there is an infinite personality in them. God in all the rectitude and benevolence of his character is present in them, not suffering them to bring wrong or harm to his creatures, but making all things in the universe "work together for good to them that love him."

This conception of God as the living God delivers us from the tyranny of the idea of law, moreover, by showing us that God is not confined to the domain of nature's laws, but while he is in them, is also above them, making them serve him. You know how man uses the laws of nature and makes them serve him. As he did not originate them, so he cannot destroy them or dispense with them. If he thinks to override one of them, like the law of gravitation, he comes down with broken bones. But it is wonderful how he can combine them to produce new effects which nature never would have produced of herself. By making use of the expansion of steam and combining this with other known mechanical laws, he can bring in a force which shall counteract the law of gravitation and can lift himself in an elevator from the bottom to the top of a building without breaking his bones at all. And the chemist can so combine the forces of nature as to produce ice in a red-hot crucible. So man, limited as he is, is yet above nature, and by

combining nature's laws in new ways can make them serve his purposes. And now, if man can do this, has the living God less power than man? Cannot he combine the laws of nature in unseen ways to accomplish his plans and to answer the prayers of his people? Nay, cannot he do more than this, namely, exercise an absolute spontaneity and freedom by making new beginnings in history without any reference to natural law at all? It is the glory of man that his will is in part an originating force, not wholly determined by the antecedents of his situation, but capable of new decisions unconnected with his former life and for which no laws of nature can account. And cannot God in like manner exercise his infinite freedom of will, inserting a new and personal force into nature, and thus working miracles of healing and resurrection and renewing of the soul? Oh, yes! Our God is not a dead God, but a living God. Law is not an exhaustive expression of his will. After law has uttered its last word, there is still room for another and more glorious manifestation of God in the merciful, helpful, pardoning, restoring aspects of his character — and that manifestation we call grace. Nature is the loose mantle in which he commonly reveals himself; but he is not fettered by the robe he wears — he can thrust it aside when he will and "make bare his arm" in providential interpositions for earthly deliverance, and in mighty movements within the bounds of history for the salvation of the sinner and for the setting up of his kingdom.

The other benefit which results to us from this conception of God as the living God, is the new vividness and reality which it gives to all God's dealings with our individual souls. So all-pervasive is the false conception of law of which I have spoken, that many Christians have come to think of God's moral attributes and doings as conditioned by it. They have come to expect more from natural causes in their own experience and in the progress of religion in the world than they expect from God. Their God is a God in fetters — a God confined and constrained, not only by the laws of his own creation, but by the laws of his own being. And so holiness and love and grace have come to be abstractions to them, and they have "limited the holy One of Israel." I fear, indeed, that in much of our modern preaching this idea has insensibly exerted far too great an influence. Even God's moral law has put on the semblance of a mere law of nature, in which the personality and living will of God is lost sight of. Sin is conceived of as misfortune and weakness, like the misstep that breaks the limb on a dark night, instead of the transgression of command and the opposition to God which the guilty conscience declares it to be. A merely subjective atonement that will repair the injury done to itself by the individual soul is said to be all-sufficient, while the offended personality of God and the necessity of satisfaction to his outraged holiness are forgotten.

And the punishment of the sinner for rejecting the atonement is made to consist only in the reaction of natural law, instead of consisting also in the just retribution and wrath which a personal God who hates all sin visits upon him who persists in ungodliness and tramples under his feet the blood of Jesus. In fine, a materializing, semi-pantheistic conception of law has risen like a vapor from the lower levels of physical research, and has enshrouded every one of the mountainous truths of revelation that used to stand out so clear in sunlight, till the life and glory of them is all gone. Do you know

the reason? The sunlight that once gave them splendor and beauty was the light that shone from the face of a personal and living God, and when the sun sets, the mountains must be dark!

But this conception of God as the living God gives us back our faith. Divine holiness is no abstraction now, but a living attribute of God, penetrated through and through with the energy and activity of will. Moral law comes now to be the manifestation, not simply of what God is, but of what he wills and demands. Obedience is recommended now not simply by our needs but by the authority of God — it is not only the best policy of the soul to yield itself to him, but it is his bounden duty — and disobedience is enmity against the law giver. Now we need an atonement, not only to reconcile us to God, but to reconcile God to us. Now we need a forgiveness which shall bring us as guilty sinners into communion once more with a personal God. And how wonderfully personal on this better view does grace become; not simply the remanding us to some new working of law, by which all shall be made of us that naturally can be, but the free, unbought extension to us of God's will and purpose of redemption, restoring us to his favor and making us sons of God! So in redemption, as in creation and providence, we recognize the relation of a personal God to our souls, putting into every act and effort of his love the warmth and directness of an infinite, divine affection. So we come into a fellowship with God which would have been utterly impossible if God had been only another name to us for law. We find one who, "in opposition to all dead abstractions, all vague head-notions, is the living Person, the source and fountain of all life, loving and loved in return." It was this for which the Psalmist longed when he cried: "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God! My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God. When shall I come and appear before God?" "What we want," says Robertson, "is not infinitude, but a boundless One; not to feel that love is the law of this universe, but to feel One whose name is Love. For else, if in this world of order there be no one in whose bosom that order is centred, and of whose being it is the expression: in this world of manifold contrivance, no personal affection which gave to the skies their trembling tenderness, and to the snow its purity; then order, affection, contrivance, wisdom, are only horrible abstractions, and we are in the dreary universe alone. It is a dark moment when the sense of that personality is lost: more terrible than the doubt of immortality. For, of the two, eternity without a personal God, or God for seventy years without immortality, no one after David's heart would hesitate. 'Give me God for life, to know and be known by Him! No thought is more hideous than that of an eternity without Him.'"

And yet I do not know that we should ever be convinced of this, if God had not shown his will and power in the incarnation. The greatest proof of will and power is self-limitation; and the self-limitation of God in the person of Christ, the voluntary resigning of his glory, the narrowing of himself to our human conditions, and the taking upon him of our burdens of guilt and penalty, these show personality as nothing else could. Not will alone, but heart also, must go to the making of a man. So he in whose image we are made shows most that he is the living God by the exhibition of his love in

the cross. For "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself;" and, as Jesus himself said: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." If we have ever thought that God was a dead God, identical with the wheels and processes of nature; if we have ever thought of him as only a thinking mechanism, a God of mere Idea and Reason, as cold and emotionless as the white clouds above our heads or the snow beneath our feet; if we have ever thought of him as mere force or arbitrary will, without care for the creatures who sin and who suffer; let our eyes be opened to see the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. There we see that God has heart as well as mind and will, that his nature is tremblingly sensitive to our human griefs and needs, that he has an eye to pity and an arm to save. The living Christ, in whom God manifests himself as the Way, the Truth and the Life, is the final and conclusive proof that God is the living God.

There are two Scripture sentences which I would leave with you in conclusion. They suggest more than a thousand admonitions or invitations could. They are both found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the one sounds as if addressed to the children of God, the other as if addressed to those who know not God. The first is this: "Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God." It suggests the glorious heritage of the Christian with whom God has entered into relations of personal friendship and communion, and the infinite possibilities that lie before him in that future city which the boundless freedom and the inventive mind of God shall fill with wonders of blessing and glory to those who love him. The other text suggests the boundless possibilities of misery and shame and condemnation that lie before the unrepenting sinner, when once he shall see face to face that infinite Being whom he has made his enemy. Ponder this text, O sinner: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God!"

XIV.

THE HOLINESS OF GOD.*

Have you ever come to the very verge of death, and then been suddenly and unexpectedly delivered? If you have not, there are some lessons that you have yet to learn. Such times of rescue are full of instruction. The veil that hides the supernatural from us seems withdrawn. God fills the whole horizon of our thought. We cease to regard him as a dream of the fancy or as an appendage of our comfort. We see him as he is — the personal and living God, the centre and stay of all things, the only eternal reality. In such hours, too, the conscience speaks, and, in the hush of earthly passion and selfishness, we perceive those moral attributes which chiefly make God to be God.

It was such a rescue from imminent destruction that occasioned the utterance of the text. It is part of the song which the saved people of Israel sang on the shore of the Red Sea, after that fearful night in which Pharaoh and his host had perished. They looked back upon the waters through which they had passed in safety, but in which their enemies had been overwhelmed, and depths of God's nature seemed opened to their view that were deeper than the depths of the sea. There was an attribute of God which had never been mentioned in previous revelations, never before had been put into a single word and so expressed to men, but which stood out clear and bright forever from the day that Moses and the children of Israel sang unto the Lord: "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods! who is like unto thee, glorious in holiness!"

That song, in which the holiness of God was the culminating theme, was not merely the natural expression of a new-born nation's gratitude and worship — it was an inspired song also. And the witness of inspiration to God's holiness has never ceased. Beginning here in the Pentateuch it goes on, in an ever-broadening and deepening stream, until we reach the book of Revelation. Throughout the Bible, holiness is the attribute insisted on more than any other. Do you say that this is only because in man's state of sin, his first and most pressing need is to be convinced that God is holy? But in heaven there is no sin, yet in heaven cherubim and seraphim continually do cry: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty!" Do you say that this prominence is given to holiness only because the revelation of it is adapted to our present stage of progress and capacity? But look beyond the present; see the eternal future portrayed in the Apocalypse; hear the host of

* Originally prepared as a sermon on the text, Ex. 15: 11—"Glorious in holiness," and preached in the Chapel of the University of Rochester, on the Day of Prayer for Colleges, January 31, 1878; subsequently printed as an article in the Examiner, January 26, February 9, and February 22, 1882.

the redeemed upon the shores of another sea, in which the last of God's foes has been overthrown; there they sing again: "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for thou only art holy!"

Since the greatest thought of the finite is the infinite, and our ruling conception of God must make or mar our earthly career and settle our eternal destiny, how important a thing it is that we should have worthy thoughts of the divine holiness! May the Spirit of holiness enlighten us while we inquire what holiness in God is, how it is distinguished from other attributes, and what place and rank it holds in his nature.

The theme which we are to consider is the greatest of themes, and one of the most difficult. The difficulty arises partly from the relation of the divine attributes to the divine essence. But here, at any rate, it is plain that the attributes are not themselves God, nor are they mere names for human conceptions of God. They have an objective existence. They are actual qualities, distinguishable from each other and from the essence to which they belong. As in matter, so in mind, qualities imply a substance in which they find their unity. God is a spiritual substance, and of this substance the attributes are inseparable characteristics and manifestations.

Holiness is one of these characteristic qualities of God. We call it an attribute, because we are compelled to attribute it to God as a fundamental power or principle of his being, in order to give rational account of certain constant facts in his self-revelations. The attributes are qualities without which God would not be God. Intellect is an attribute of man, because man would not be man without it. — And here arises another difficulty. Every essential attribute of a moral being has both its active and its passive sides. Active truth presupposes passive truth; truthful speaking, thinking, knowing, are impossible without truth of being.

Otherwise, the attributes of God would be his acts; his very being would be synonymous with his volition. This cannot be; although such names as Thomasius and Julius Müller might be cited as its advocates. If God were primarily will, and the essence of God were his act, it would be in the power of God to annihilate himself, and our primitive belief in God's necessary existence would be a delusion. Behind all the active aspects of God's attributes we must recognize the passive. Love is an active principle in God, but it could not be active unless there were a foundation for this activity in its very nature. And in any thorough analysis of the attributes, either of man or of God, the consideration of the passive side must come first, — the thought of the attribute as quality must come before the thought of the attribute as power.

Let us now apply what has been said to the attribute of holiness. What is holiness? I think we shall say at once that it is purity. When we speak of a pure soul, we mean not simply that the acts of that soul show an undeviating rectitude, that its words are transparently true and just, that its very emotions and thoughts are free from all sensuous or selfish stain, but we mean that the spirit itself, in its inmost substance and essence, is devoid of all tendency or impulse toward the wrong.

Among men we know that there is only an approximation to such purity as this. Absolute purity is not even an episode with us. We are never wholly single in our motive. Even when we would do good, evil is present with us,

and below the surface-stream, which sometimes seems so clear, there are turbid undercurrents which God sees even if we do not. Most often two streams, plain even to our own sight, flow on side by side, like the Arve after its junction with the Rhone; or the Ohio, made up of the Alleghany and the Monongahela, not yet fully united. The muddy current is the current of our natural life, but we are compelled to recognize in the clear stream a branch of the river of the water of life that flows from the throne of God. That stream which joins itself to ours to purify and cleanse is clear as crystal. It proceeds from deep unfathomable fountains in the being of God, and it flows on and on without change or stint forever. What then must that purity be from which all purity in men or angels is derived, as the trickling rill from the inexhaustible reservoir!

And yet we must not allow ourselves to think of holiness in God as if it were a passive purity only. All God's thoughts and deeds in truth are pure, because they flow from deeper than Artesian sources in his clear and perfect nature. But then we are speaking of a moral nature, even when we use these physical analogies. The purity of God is also a purity that reveals itself in active will. Men ignore this consciously or unconsciously. They conceive of holiness in God as a still and moveless purity, like the unspotted whiteness of the new-fallen snow, or the stainless serenity of the blue sky after a summer rain. They forget that all God's moral attributes are penetrated and pervaded by will.

In God there is nothing inert. He is alive in every part. That mighty will which brought the universe into being, and which unweariedly sustains it from hour to hour — that mighty will whose reflection and result we see in the fixed successions of nature, and in the majestic order of science — that will is the active element in God's holiness. Holiness is purity, but purity unsleeping — the most tremendous energy in the universe eternally and unchangeably exerting itself — "that living Will that shall endure, when all that seems shall suffer shock."

Holiness, then, is not the passive material purity that is unconscious of itself and indifferent to change or injury. It is purity in conscious and determined movement. All the intensity of human volition, all the combined energy of all human wills, is as feebleness compared with that concentration of mental and spiritual power which is involved in the holiness of God. Holiness in him is imaged in the sea of glass, of which the book of Revelation speaks. It is of crystal purity, but there is more than that. In it the enemies of God are overwhelmed. It is a "sea of glass mingled with fire!"

I have said that God's holiness is purity exercising will — purity willing. What is the object of this willing? I answer, itself. Holiness in God is purity willing, affirming, asserting, maintaining, itself. In virtue of his holiness, God eternally asserts and maintains his own moral excellence. We have a faint analogue in human experience. There is such a thing as a man's duty to himself. You respect no man who does not respect himself. You revere genuine dignity of character. When the fierceness of slander or of temptation assaults the true man, there is no nobler sight on earth than to see him holding fast his integrity, and asserting his innocence before God and the world. So did Job of old, and within certain limits God justified

Job's self-affirming righteousness against the cruel accusations of his false friends.

Self-preservation is the law of life. Shall it be the law of all the lower creation, teaching the birds and the beasts their arts of defense, and men and nations to be jealous of their rights and liberties, and shall it not be the law of virtue, that highest life of all? Shall purity not stand for itself and maintain its own existence? Ah, it is not till men have purity, that they feel their right to live. It is the pure soul that has in it the clear instinct of immortality. Get God's life into you, and it becomes duty to live, and to assert and maintain that life forevermore.

Aye, there are times in the experience of the Christian when this new and God-given purity seems lifted up above the strife with sin. For a moment we seem to catch a glimpse of our heavenly freedom. Then we see that holiness is not simply the antithesis to moral evil, so that its existence is dependent upon the existence of that which is its opposite. We see that purity in the soul is a positive thing, and not a negative. Without a glance at the sin that seems for a brief space put beneath our feet, our whole being rejoices that it reflects something of the light which no man hath seen or can see, and that it will reflect that light of the divine purity throughout eternity.

These are but faint analogies, but they are real analogies, of something infinitely higher than themselves. There is a self-preserving instinct, a self-maintaining life, a self-asserting purity in man. And is there no instinct of self-preservation in God? Shall the central life of all life not maintain itself? Shall the source of all purity not respect itself and assert itself? We say, "Let justice be done though the heavens fall." Let us rather say, "Because justice is done, the heavens do not fall." If God could be unjust to himself, the universe would perish. The purity of God, forever maintaining itself, divine perfection asserting itself as the highest good and the highest end, infinite moral excellence willing its own perpetuity and dominion — this is the holiness of God. Purity of substance, energy of will, self-affirmation — these make up the idea of it. In a word, holiness in God is the self-affirming purity of the divine nature.

Let us now, as the second division of our great theme, inquire what relation the holiness of God sustains to other attributes of his being. And first, to justice. The answer easily presents itself. Justice is simply transitive holiness, or holiness exercised toward creatures. The same holiness which exists in God in eternity past, manifests itself as justice, so soon as moral intelligences come into being. Before creation God was holiness, just as he was love and truth. The one God—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—is sufficient to himself. As he has in himself an infinite object of knowledge, he is the eternal truth. As he has in himself an infinite object of affection, he is the eternal love. And as he has in himself an infinite object of will, he is the eternal holiness. The trinity in unity assures God's independence, his sovereignty, his blessedness. He does not need to create for his own sake. Because God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, there is the foundation for intelligence, communion, activity, in the infinite ranges of his own being. If he creates, therefore, it is not to augment his own blessedness, but to communicate it to others. If he makes the worlds, it is not of necessity, but of grace.

God is holy, whether creation exists or not. But the moment moral creatures come into being, this holiness of God has relations to them, and holiness in relation to creatures is justice. The self-affirming purity of God demands a like purity in those who have been made in his image. As God wills and maintains his own moral excellence, so all creatures must will and maintain the moral excellence of God. There can be only one centre in the solar system. The sun is its own centre and the centre for all the planets also. So God's purity is the object of his own will, and it must be the object of all the wills of all his creatures also. See how all arbitrariness is excluded here. God is what he is — infinite purity. He cannot change. If creatures are to attain the end of their being, then, they must be like God in moral purity. Justice is nothing but the publication and enforcement of this natural necessity.

The law of God, therefore, is simply a transcript of God's being — the holiness of God in the form of moral requirement. Law can no more be different from what it is, than God can be different from what he is. And justice does not make law — it only reveals law. Justice is holiness declaring to creatures, in their own constitution, in conscience, in providence, and in the written word, the fundamental facts of being.

In this sense justice is legislative holiness. But justice is executive holiness also. God will not only demand purity in his creatures, but he will enforce this demand. That mighty will that asserts the divine purity as the thing of supreme worth, will flow on like an infinite river and bear upon its bosom the whole universe of moral beings. Resist that current, and you are overwhelmed by it. Because God is God, you must perish. That mighty will is the substance and strength of law. When you make your thrust against the law, by transgression, you find that law is elastic; because the living will of God is in it, there is a counter-thrust that prostrates and destroys you.

And so retributive justice, binding moral evil and penal misery together in inevitable and dreadful union, is simply the reaction of God's holiness against its antagonist and would-be destroyer. Punishment is God's holy will maintaining and vindicating the divine purity. Justice itself is legislative and retributive holiness; and God can cease to demand purity and to punish sin, only when he ceases to be holy, that is, only when he ceases to be God.

Holiness, in the form of justice, is therefore necessarily the detecter and condemner and punisher of impurity and selfishness. The whole nature of God is affected with revulsion from moral evil, and not only with revulsion but with abhorrence and indignation. But let us remember that this anger of God against the wicked is not a human anger. In it is no passion or malice. It is the legitimate expression of God's purity, the calm judicial vindication of his righteousness, the exact apportionment of retribution to transgression. God's holiness as much binds him to punish sin, as sin binds the sinner to be punished.

Years ago the city of Rochester witnessed a strange scene. Senator Ira Harris, then Judge of the Supreme Court, was to pronounce sentence of death upon a brutal criminal, whose ignorance of the English language made necessary the intervention of an interpreter, even to communicate to him

the meaning of the words that sealed his doom. Those who knew Judge Harris have not forgotten the large mould of his mind and the correspondingly magnificent port of the man. The bearing of the Judge that day seemed the very embodiment of the majesty and impartiality of the law, but coupled with this there was a deep compassion for the miserable being before him. As he addressed the convicted man tears were seen trickling down his cheeks, his voice trembled and broke, he could not go on. The solemn hush of that court-room was like the silence of the grave that was just opening to receive the murderer. Justice paused — but justice must be done. With a struggle that shook his whole frame Judge Harris regained his self-control, and the words were spoken that consigned the criminal to a felon's death. Those words were awful, because it was felt that there could be no recall.

So God's compassion lingers ere it speaks the sinner's separation from him forever; but that lingering only makes more remediless the sinner's fate. The justice that has in it no semblance or trace of human caprice, the justice that only makes manifest to the universe the natural relations between the purity of God and the creature's sin, the justice that renders its desert to moral evil even at the cost of its own grief, this is the justice that the sinner has to fear. The very absence from it of all earthly passion is its characteristic mark. And so we represent justice as holding an even scale, and as weighing merit and demerit with bandaged eyes. She is no respecter of persons, and from her decisions there is no appeal.

There is one other attribute to which holiness has an important, but a very different relation. I mean the benevolence or love of God. Let us understand clearly what love is. It is the impulse to self-communication, the attribute in virtue of which God is moved to give, of his own life and blessedness. Love existed in God, before men existed, or before angels were made. "Thou lovedst me," says Jesus, "before the foundation of the world." From eternity God was love, because from eternity there was the communication of all his fullness to the Son. In Christ and through Christ, God gives of his own life and blessedness to us.

Do we not know from our experience of earthly love what this self-giving, self-imparting, self-communication is? Do we call that love, in which there is no giving, but only demanding, taking, receiving? Do we believe in a person's love, who fastens himself to us because of the praise we give him or the good of whatever sort he can get from us? No, there is no true love without self-sacrifice, self-devotion, the merging of my interests in your interests, the giving of myself to you that my life may fill and bless your life. And this is God's love — the giving of himself for us and to us in Jesus Christ. "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us." When the Son of God gives up all for us upon the cross of shame, when he gives himself to us by entering our hearts and uniting himself indissolubly with us, then and then only we see what is the nature and essence of love.

We see at once that love cannot be resolved into holiness. Self-impartation is very different from self-affirmation. The attribute which moves God to pour out is not identical with the attribute which impels him to maintain. Self-communicating grace is not the same with self-preserving purity. Nor

on the other hand can we resolve holiness into love. The two ideas are as distinct as the idea of integrity on the one hand and of generosity on the other.

One may call holiness God's self-love, if he will, but this gives only a superficial and verbal unity. Self-love is not love at all, for there is in it no element of self-surrender. We cannot turn holiness into love, then, merely by giving it a name into which the word "love" enters as a component part. In truth, holiness is wrongly described as "self-love," even when this term is taken in its proper sense. Self-love is the desire for one's own interest and happiness. But God's holiness is something infinitely nobler than this. The utilitarian element is wholly wanting from it. God wills and maintains his own moral excellence not because of the good which will flow to him thereby, but simply because that moral excellence is in itself the thing of supreme worth. As no man is truly virtuous who loves virtue for what he can make by it, so God has no ulterior motive in being holy, and for this reason holiness can never be defined as God's self-love, or the desire for his own interest and happiness.

If holiness, then, is not even God's self-love, much less is it God's love to the universe. It is not a form of benevolence toward his creatures, a manifestation of desire for their good. It has an independent basis in the nature of God, and so exists before and apart from creation. Yet no error in modern thinking is more prevalent or more pernicious in its results than this one, of making holiness to be a mere exercise of love.

See how far-reaching the consequences of this error are! Holiness in God ceases to be valuable for what it is in itself — it becomes valuable only as a means to an end. Happiness is the only good and the only end. If the happiness of the universe required it, God might cease to be holy; he would be bound to be unholy, if greater good might come thereby. Law is only an expedient for the attainment of happiness, and may be done away when it fails of securing its end. Punishment is only a means of reforming the offender, or of deterring others from following his example. Sin can be pardoned without atonement, and the incorrigible transgressor may be loosed so soon as punishment ceases to be of benefit. And so the foundations of every important doctrine of Christianity are swept away. Law, sin, atonement, retribution — all these defenses of the faith are untenable, when once the Redan, the citadel of God's holiness, is surrendered to the foe.

How completely opposed to right reason is this view that holiness is a form of benevolence, a means of securing happiness! If this were so, supreme regard for happiness would be the very essence of all virtue. But we know that to serve God for the mere sake of reward to ourselves, or of happiness to others, is not to serve him at all. Holiness is binding upon us entirely apart from its useful results. God is displeased with unholiness, entirely apart from the effects of misery which follow in its train. His law, like the sun in the heavens, declares and reflects his glory. God must punish the violators of that law, whether the punished are benefited thereby or not. Sin is intrinsically ill-deserving, and must be punished on that account — not because punishment will work good to the universe; indeed, no punishment can be of benefit to the universe that is not just and necessary in itself.

Justice moreover is something invariable; it comes equally to all. It cannot be the same as love, for love varies with the moral worth of the object and with the sovereign pleasure of the bestower. It is the very nature of love to choose out the object of its affection. Men choose the ends to which they will devote their charities and we call them benevolent, and God dispenses his bounty as he will. He gives to one and withholds from another. Poverty and riches, ignorance and intellect, follow no law of merit. But God does not dispense justice thus. That is something which every man may claim from him. Surely this justice that varies not, is not a mere name for love, that has its endless gradations and that declares its freedom in the infinite variety of gifts and conditions which it distributes among mankind.

But let us turn to Scripture wholly. Why does the Psalmist pray that God will chasten him not in anger? Because chastening in anger is different from chastening in love, and the fatherly chastening of the Lord is the opposite of being condemned with the world. God hates, abhors and destroys the wicked; hatred, abhorrence and destruction are not love nor forms of love. Many times in Scripture is chastening referred to love: "Whom the Lord loveth, he chasteneth." But nowhere in the whole range of God's word is punishment referred to love; many times it is referred to holiness. In the book of Revelation, when the great whore is judged, the company of heaven cry: "True and righteous are thy judgments!" When the wicked are destroyed, the saints say with one voice: "Who shall not fear thee, for thou only art holy!"

Not from love to the universe does God punish. "I do not this for your sakes," he says, "but for my holy name's sake." The fires that fell from heaven upon Sodom and Gomorrha were not acts of mercy to soften hard hearts and bring sinners to repentance. They were manifestations of self-vindicating holiness, visiting indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon persistent wickedness, cutting short the day of grace, removing forever the chance of reformation, and ushering the enemies of God not into a world of new opportunities and privileges, but into a world of retribution compared with which, as Jesus himself intimates, the fire and brimstone of the earthly destruction were far more tolerable. God is love indeed, but God is light also; and because he is moral light, in whom is no darkness at all of impurity or sin, to all iniquity he is a consuming fire.

Holiness and love both exist in God. We have seen what holiness is, and how it differs from love. Let us ask last of all, which of these is to be regarded as the primary and fundamental attribute of the divine nature? We have but two sources of information here, our own moral constitution and the word of God. From our own nature we may learn something of the nature of him in whose image we are made. Let us recall that great discovery of Bishop Butler: "the supremacy of conscience in the moral constitution of man." To conscience every other impulse and affection, voluntarily or involuntarily, has to bow. Happiness and righteousness stand on two very different planes, and righteousness is evermore the higher. The money in my hands may be needed to help a family in distress; yet, if it is my only means of paying an honest debt, even to a man who needs it not, I am bound to pay my debt, though the family starve. Be just before you are generous, conscience whispers always.

Now that which is highest in us is highest also in God. As we may be kind, but must be righteous, so God, in whose image we are made, may be merciful, but must be holy. Mercy is optional with him. He was not under compulsion to provide a redemption for sinners. Salvation is a matter of grace, not of debt. He can apply the salvation he has wrought out, to whomsoever he will. "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy," is his word. Love is an attribute which, like omnipotence, God may exercise or not exercise, as he will. But with holiness it is not so. Holiness must be exercised everywhere. We thank God for his mercy—for this is the free act of his grace. But we never thank him for speaking the truth — for this he must do from the necessity of his own nature. Justice must be done always; otherwise God would be unjust; shall not the Judge of all the earth do right? But who of all this world of sinners could complain if God should pardon others, but not pardon him? Can we doubt then whether love or holiness is the more fundamental in the divine nature?

But look once more to Scripture and the light is clearer still. See there the actual dealings of God. See how holiness conditions and limits the exercise of every other attribute. See how redeeming love, when it would save mankind, can do this only by itself submitting to the rod of justice and suffering in our stead,—violated holiness requiring expiation for sin, while love submissively meets and answers its requisitions. See how the eternal punishment of the wicked reveals the holiness of God, even when love can hope for no relief or benefit to the transgressor,— the demand of holiness for self-vindication overbearing the pleading of love for the sufferers.

Does the word of God teach that there is such a thing as everlasting death? Does God not only pity the sinner, but abhor and repel him? Does he press into the conscience with his condemning sentence, frown upon the wrong-doer with an angry eye, drive the wicked from him with a flaming sword, prophesy eternal wrath in the world to come? Does love hide her head from the finally impenitent, and the mercy of the Lamb change to the wrath of the Lamb? Then there must be a principle of God's nature, not only independent of love, but superior to love. Even so it is. The mighty will that constitutes the stay and life of the universe is directed toward one thing — the maintenance, revelation and diffusion of holiness. Not the holiness of the happy, but the happiness of the holy; peace to the pure, but to the impure everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord — this is the plan on which the universe is built.

What has been said throws, in my judgment, a new and valuable light upon the great question of future punishment. The common view that holiness is a form of love, or is under bonds to love, can justify the penalties of the world to come, only from considerations of utility,— to use the words of Mr. Beecher: "I believe that punishment exists both here and hereafter, but it will not continue after it ceases to do good. With a God who could give pain for pain's sake, this world would go out like a candle." So the Universalist holds that "the punishment of the wicked, however severe and terrible it may be, is but a means to a beneficent end; not revengful, but remedial; not for its own sake, but for the good of those who suffer its infliction."* And some, who can see no good to be reaped from punishment by

* Art. "Universalism," in Johnson's Universal Cyclopædia.

the lost themselves, declare that punishment is for the good of the universe. The security of free creatures is to be attained through a gratitude for deliverance, "kept alive by a constant example of some who are justly suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." So says Dr. Joel Parker.*

Let us ask these writers also: What beneficial effect can these sufferings have upon the universe, unless they are just in themselves? And if just in themselves, then the reason for their continuance lies not in any benefit to the universe, or to the sufferers, that may accrue therefrom. "If the Universalists' position were true,"— I quote here from a late English Review,†—"we should expect to find some manifestations of love and pity and sympathy in the infliction of the dreadful punishments of the future. We look in vain for this, however. We read of God's anger, of his judgments, of his fury, of his taking vengeance, but we get no hint, in any passage which describes the sufferings of the next world, that they are designed to work the redemption and recovery of the soul. If the punishments of the wicked were chastisements, we should expect to see some bright outlook in the Bible-picture of the place of doom. A gleam of light, one might suppose, would make its way from the celestial city to this dark abode. The sufferers would catch some sweet refrain of heavenly music, which would be a promise and prophecy of a far-off but coming glory. But there is a finality about the Scripture-statements of the condition of the lost which is simply terrible."

The reason for punishment lies in the holiness of God. That holiness reveals itself in the moral constitution of the universe. It makes itself felt in conscience, imperfectly here, fully hereafter. The wrong merits punishment. The right binds, not because it is the expedient, but because it is the very nature of God. "But the great ethical significance of this word *right* will not be known,"—I quote again from Dr. Patton,—"its imperative claims, its sovereign behests, its holy and imperious sway over the moral creation will not be understood, until we witness, during the lapse of the judgment-hours, the terrible retribution which measures the ill-desert of wrong." Is this a doctrine of "pain for pain's sake?" Ah, no! God has no pleasure in the death of him that dieth. It is a doctrine of pain for holiness' sake; the necessary suffering of the transgressor who spurns God's love; the inevitable reaction against itself of a human nature that was made for purity, but is now lost to purity; the involuntary vindication, on the part of the sinner, of the great truth that in the nature of God the two infinites love and holiness are not commensurate, but that holiness is evermore supreme.

Triumphant holiness, submissive love,—are these then in conflict with each other? Is there duality, instead of harmony, in the nature of God? Ah, there would be, but for one fact — the fact of the cross. The first and worst tendency of sin is its tendency to bring discord into the being of God, by setting holiness at war with love, and love at war with holiness. And since both these attributes are exercised toward sinners of the human race, the otherwise inevitable antagonism between them is removed only by the atoning death of the God-man. Their opposing claims do not impair the divine blessedness, because the reconciliation exists in the eternal counsels of God:

* Lectures on Universalism.

† Art. by F. L. Patton, in Brit. and For. Evang. Rev., Jan. 1878, p. 137.

Christ is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." In him and in his cross, long before the Savior came, "mercy and truth met together, righteousness and peace kissed each other." Even Calvary, with its bleeding love on the part of the Son, and the darkness and horror of that forsaking on the part of the Father, could not have accomplished in those few hours the redemption of the world, if it had not been the drawing-back of the veil that had hid an eternal fact in the nature of God, in other words, if it had not been a revelation of God himself. In the cross, we see the majesty of holiness at one with the self-abnegation of infinite love. That God might still be just, while pardoning the transgressor, the Judge gave himself to death for us. He bore the wrath of violated holiness, that we might be saved from wrath through him.

And yet, let us not imagine that love fails to have proper recognition, when we make holiness supreme. It is only in the light of this holiness of God that we can properly estimate God's love to sinners. When we think of what holiness is, it would indeed at first sight seem to exclude love. The most impossible of all things would seem to be, that this God, whose holiness is the fundamental and controlling attribute of his being, should love those who have broken the bonds of his authority and have polluted themselves with moral evil. Sin is an abomination to him. His purity loathes it; his judicial sentence condemns it; his anger burns against it. And yet, wonder of wonders! — he loves the sinner and cannot see him perish. The complex nature of God is strangely capable at once of these two mighty emotions — hatred of the sin and love for the sinner; or, to put it more accurately, love for the sinner, as he is a creature with infinite capacities of joy or sorrow, of purity or wickedness, but simultaneous hatred for that same sinner, as he is an enemy to holiness and to God.

Except as we scale the heights of God's holiness, we shall never fathom the depths of God's love. Only as we see the inaccessible whiteness of that celestial purity that rises like Alpine summits far-withdrawn, can we begin to appreciate the love that stooped to inconceivable abasement, that it might lift us out of the blackness and hell of our depravity and guilt. Against this solemn back-ground of holiness and judicial indignation, the yearning pity and the melting tenderness of the Godhead seem inexpressibly sweet and fair. The Old Testament must come before the New, the Law before the Gospel, John the Baptist before Christ, or all these last lose their dignity and significance. And what the preaching and the teaching of our day needs most of all is a profound conviction of that holiness of God which will by no means clear the guilty, and which charges guilt upon every impure act, disposition or state of human soul.

A great teacher, as he gave his last counsels to a class of young men in course of training for the active work of life, said to them these words: "Would that upon the naked palpitating heart of each one of you might be laid one red-hot coal of God Almighty's wrath!" And thus I would say, also, if I could only know that love would follow, and would quench that coal with one precious drop of the red blood of Christ. Nay, will love ever follow and heal and deliver, if the sense of wrath has not gone before? No man in his sins, indeed, can ever enter into the blaze of God's holiness, and live. Yet some sight of it, such as the Spirit gives, is the indispensable condition

of a lofty Christian life,—yes, is an indispensable condition of salvation. From the sight of holiness we need to be led on to the sight of love, or the end will be only remorse and despair. Yet still it is true that there can be no more salutary discipline and preparation, either as respects the learning of doctrine or the doing of duty, than those which are derived from a heart-searching, awe-inspiring apprehension of the divine holiness; for it is the law, in which that holiness is revealed, that is the appointed school-master, to lead us to Christ.

I would fain close this sermon with an appeal to every hearer who is not yet a Christian, and to every Christian whose conceptions of God's purity have hitherto been faint and dull, that he will seek a new knowledge of this attribute of God. May God himself, by his Holy Spirit, be our teacher, that we may see how great and just a God he is with whom we have to deal; how impossible it is without holiness for any man to see the Lord; how deep is the blackness of our sin against the whiteness of his purity; how needful it was that the Son of God should die to save us from it; how instant and immediate is the necessity of repentance and renewal; how certain is the doom of the unrepenting transgressor; and how fearful a thing it is to fall into the hands of the living God. Why should I not address directly any hearer who is yet unsaved, and say to him: My friend, if you are ever saved, either God must change, or you must. He must either cease to be God by giving up his holiness, or you must cease your rebellion and become pure. Do you think that he will change? Ah! he changes not. Make sure then that you change your place and character and life; for you must change, or die!

For my part I give in my allegiance gladly to this holiness of God. I know that I must bend to the mighty Will that moves and controls all things, whether I will or no. I had rather be the molten iron that runs freely into the mould prepared by the great Designer, than be the cold iron that must be hammered into shape. I know that the whole universe must bow to that holy will at last. I would not be among the spirits that bow in hell. But this is not my reason for giving in my allegiance to holiness. I bow to it because it is the highest, the fairest, the grandest thing of all. I bow to it because it is the only worthy object of homage and love and service in the universe. To be like God, to be pure as God is pure, to be partaker of his holiness,—this, to a created being, is the summit of all honor and ambition. Will you not choose this end with me? Will you not recognize this supreme fact of the universe, and give in your allegiance to the holiness of God?

On the day after the first gun was fired at Fort Sumter, the citizens of Chicago gathered in the vast auditorium in which the National Convention had nominated Abraham Lincoln, to take the oath of allegiance to the government and to the Constitution. It was said that twenty thousand men stood under that single roof. They were of all classes and all parties, but it seemed to me that the spirit of God had made them one. A Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States stood forth and held aloft a Bible, and called upon every man in that vast multitude to hold up his right hand and swear. With a voice that reached the remotest corners of the great enclosure, he repeated the first words of the oath: "We do solemnly swear!" And like the sounding of the sea, or the breaking of thunder from the sky, all that multitudinous host repeated after him: "We do solemnly swear!"

"To support the Constitution of the United States!" And still they followed: "To support the Constitution of the United States!" And so the oath proceeded till the solemn close: "So help us, God!" For many a man, the taking of that oath meant the giving up of property and life; but it was taken with an intense and exultant enthusiasm, for the cause of the country was felt to be the cause of God. If there were traitors there that day, they made no sign. Rebellion hid itself in fear.

There shall be a greater gathering soon. The universe shall assemble to recognize the right of holiness to reign. I hear the multitude that no man can number cry, as the voice of many waters and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying: "Alleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!" Will you be among those who give in their allegiance to God's holiness, on that great day? or will you be among those whose impenitence and rebellion is punished by exclusion from the presence of God and from the society of the holy? I pray you, avoid that fate, if you are still unreconciled to God, by making your peace with him without delay. Join yourself to Christ by submission and trust, and that God whose purity now seems only to repel and menace will seem "glorious in holiness," and this attribute of his will become the object of your deepest homage, the pledge of your defense from evil, and the model for a strenuous character and an unspotted life!

XV.

THE TWO NATURES OF CHRIST.*

It is the question of the ages. Propounded eighteen centuries ago, it has been a living question ever since, and it was never agitated so much as now. Every year the press brings forth its new life of Christ. The term "Christology" is a coinage of our own generation, and it indicates that the study of Christ's person has become a science by itself. The New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ wins more readers to-day than any other book in the world. The character of Christ is the standard of all excellence, even by the confession of those who are enemies to his gospel; and he himself declares that by our attitude toward him we shall be judged. The question "What think ye of the Christ?" is asked of each one of us to-night; it will be asked of us when we stand at last before God; and the answer will determine our eternal destiny. I am glad that the Scriptures enable us to answer it aright. They point us to the two natures of our Lord which united constitute him the ladder from earth to heaven. On the one hand, he is the Son of Man; on the other hand, he is the Son of God. It is my purpose, first, to show what these phrases mean; and then, secondly, to draw from them certain important practical lessons.

Observe then that Christ is Son of Man. This can mean nothing less than that Christ is *true man*. It means much more besides, but let us first grasp and insist upon this. Christ is man. The ancient docetic view which held so strongly to his divinity that it left no room for his humanity — the view that in the incarnation Deity passed through the body of the Virgin as water through a reed, taking up into itself nothing of the human nature through which it passed — this was all an ignoring and a contradiction of Scripture. When the New Testament assures us that Jesus Christ was the Son of David and of the stock of Israel, when it describes him as sitting weary upon Jacob's well, as sleeping upon the rower's cushion, as suffering upon the cross, and as breathing out his soul in death, there is one thing which we cannot mistake and that is that this Son of Man is *man*. And that not simply as respects the reality of his human body. He had a human mind also, and that mind was subject to the ordinary laws of human development. He grew in wisdom, as well as in stature and in favor with God and man. In his mother's arms he was not the omniscient babe that some have supposed. In his later years he suffered, being tempted, as he could not have suffered, if all things had been open to his gaze. Even to the last, it would seem that he was ignorant of the day of the end, for "of that day," he tells us, "knoweth no man, neither the angels of God, neither the Son, but the

* Preached in Sage Chapel, Cornell University, May 25, 1884, as a sermon on the text, Mat. 22: 42 — "What think ye of the Christ? Whose son is he?"

Father." Not till his twelfth year, at his interview with the doctors in the temple, does he apparently become fully conscious that he is the Sent of God, the Son of God; and even then he must learn obedience to parents, and prepare for his public ministry by the gradual growth of mind and heart and will, amid the humble duties of son, brother, citizen, and member of the Jewish Synagogue.

There are two pictures by modern artists, the one of which illustrates the false, and the other the true view of Jesus' human development. The first is by Overbeck, the celebrated German painter. It represents the child Jesus at play in Joseph's work-shop. Child as he is, his great future sacrifice looms up before him continually, and even in his play he is fashioning sticks and blocks into the shape of a cross, and so is rehearsing in his infancy the tragedy of Calvary. I see no indication in Scripture that this conception is true, or that the great future experiences of our Lord were ever thus early anticipated. The second picture is by Holman Hunt, the Englishman. It is entitled "The Shadow of the Cross." It also represents the carpenter's shop at Nazareth. At the close of a weary day, when the level rays of the setting sun are streaming through the door, Jesus, the carpenter, turns from his toil and stretches out his arms in sheer fatigue. The shadow of those outstretched arms, and of that relaxed and tired form, is thrown upon the opposite wall. There the long upright saw, and the smaller tools ranged transversely, make the rude semblance of a cross, and the shadow of the Savior falls upon it. At one side, Mary, the mother of Jesus, weary of the long delay in the manifestation of her Son, has been trying to revive her faith in those old promises that had accompanied his birth, by opening the casket in which had been kept the gold, frankincense and myrrh, which the wise men from the east had brought. The sudden stopping of Jesus' work startles the mother, and turning to look at the Savior, her eye falls upon that prophetic cross upon the wall and the shadowy form of her Son stretched upon it, and the sword pierces her own heart also. But Jesus does not see the cross; his face is turned from it. His is still a countenance of youthful energy,— weariness and sadness, if you please, but still, not yet of anguish; his hour is not yet come. Holman Hunt's picture is truer to the gospel narrative than Overbeck's. Instead of fashioning crosses, Jesus was far more probably, as Justin Martyr, the old church Father, tells us, making ploughs and yokes, and so by hard manual toil supporting the widowed mother whom Joseph's death had left dependent upon his care. Jesus walked by faith, not by sight. His knowledge was a growing knowledge. His prayers were real prayers — full of strong crying and tears. He was made perfect through suffering. And all this testifies that he was one of us — a veritable man like ourselves.

But was there nothing peculiar about the humanity of Jesus? Ah yes, he was not only man — he was the *ideal man*. When he is called Son of man, it is intimated that he is man in the highest possible sense, the central, typical man, in whom is realized the perfect idea of humanity as it existed in the mind of God. By this I do not mean that in all respects this glory belonged to him in the days of his flesh. Those were days of humiliation. I do not know that the man Christ Jesus was surpassingly beautiful in his physical form. At first sight, it might seem strange that we have no authen-

tic description of Jesus' person. Whether he was great or small of stature, we know not. The passage in Josephus with respect to his appearance is unquestionably spurious, and the portrait said to have been presented to King Abgarus does not date back further than to the seventh century. Was our Lord exceptionally noble, or exceptionally mean, in person? We cannot say with certainty. Scripture has been cited to sustain each hypothesis. In the synagogue of Nazareth, the "gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth" would almost seem to betoken the noble presence and winning manner of the natural orator; while, on his way to Jerusalem to suffer, there was a majesty of mien which so deeply impressed the disciples that they were amazed and afraid. But then we read in the prophets, that "his visage is more marred than any man;" "he hath no form nor comeliness, and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." So the Byzantine painters conceived that they had full warrant for representing Christ as emaciated, and aged before his time,—did not the people say to this young man: "Thou art not yet fifty years old?" But on the other hand, the Italian painters represented him as the model of all manly beauty,—did not the Psalmist say: "Thou art fairer than the children of men?" Perhaps the truth is midway between the two. Christ joined himself to our average humanity; so far as personal advantages were concerned, taking that which is neither exceptionally mean nor exceptionally noble. But just as there are persons, undistinguished from the rest, who in times of sorrow seem positively ugly, but through whose plain features at other times of spiritual exaltation the rapt soul seems to shine so gloriously that the poor earthly investiture is transfigured, and you wonder that you ever thought of them as other than beautiful, so it may be that the Son of man, in his common, every-day, working garb of humanity, appeared only as the man of sorrows, while to little children there was a smile that drew them to his arms, to earnest seekers of salvation he was full of grace and truth, and to his trusted followers upon the mountain-top there was the flashing forth of a supernatural majesty and glory. So he teaches us that mere physical endowments are not the noblest, but that if we seek first the kingdom of God even these things shall be added to us, as "the head that once was covered with thorns, is crowned with glory now."

Of what temperament was Jesus? Mercurial or saturnine, lymphatic or phlegmatic, nervous or equable, sanguine or calm? Who does not perceive, the moment the question is asked, that none of these temperaments predominated in him? The story of his life gives us illustrations of the best features of them all. He can be swift and direct as the thunderbolt against hypocrisy; he can be deep and calm as the summer sea, when he comforts his disciples. Who ever thinks of Christ as a Jew? There was no Jewish grasping or bigotry in him. All the free spirit and æsthetic insight of the Greek, all the Roman reverence for law, all the Hebrew worship of holiness, all the love that breaks down the barriers of the nations and makes all races one—all these were in Christ. What woman, though she were the tenderest and most delicate of all, ever thought that Jesus would be more able to sympathize with her if he were woman instead of man? Chaucer wrote long ago: "Christ was a maid, though shapen as a man." All the spiritual excellences of both the sexes were in him,—he possessed the feminine as well

as the masculine virtues. Indeed, without gentleness and sympathy no high manhood is possible. True manhood is something more than mere masculinity. Plato says that each human being is but a moiety of the perfect creature, wandering through the wide and barren earth to find its other half. Shakspeare echoes the thought when he declares that:

> "He is the half part of a blessed man,
> Left to be finished by such as she;
> And she a fair divided excellence,
> Whose fullness of perfection lies in him."

And so Tennyson says:

> "Yet in long years liker must they grow;
> The man be more of woman, she of man;
> He gain in sweetness and in moral light,
> Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world."

And the same poet addresses Christ and says:

> "Thou seemest human and divine,
> The highest, holiest manhood, thou;
> Our wills are ours, we know not how;
> Our wills are ours to make them thine."

Have we ever reflected that all the qualities which attract our love in men, aye, even in the dearest object of our earthly affection, exist in Christ in infinitely greater degree and abundance? All true and noble souls, whether regenerate or unregenerate, are but faint reflections of this glory of him who is original and only light of the world. All the excellencies of character that appear in John, Paul, Augustine, Luther; the intellectual acumen, the emotional fervor, the power of conscience, the energy of will, that make great thinkers, great friends, great reformers, great men, are only scattered rays, which find their focus in the humanity of Christ. He is no still Thomas a Kempis — seraphic in devotion, but holding himself aloft from his age and making little impression on it; he is no fiery John Knox — stern and hard in all his indignant righteousness; but he has all the good in both of these, with none of their defects, — aye, all the good of a thousand others like them melted into one. He includes in himself all objects and reasons for affection and worship, so that love him as we may we never can love too much, but must ever come infinitely short of his desert. He includes in himself all the possible perfections of humanity — all the perfections needful to make him our eternal model — all the perfections which finite humanity is progressively to realize through the ages that are to come.

I have said that Christ is man, and that he is the ideal man. But I must lead you further. Christ is the *life-giving man*. He not only has humanity, and perfect humanity, but he gives it to others. He is not simply the bright, consummate flower of the race, the noblest fruit from this human stem, but he is a new beginning and fountain-head of humanity, the second Adam, in whom the race that had been despoiled of its inheritance in the first Adam finds its true source of spiritual life. So absolutely new is this beginning, this inauguration of a fresh and pure humanity within the bounds of the old race, that skeptics have denied the possibility of it, and have called it an effect without a cause. But we are persuaded that the same God who created humanity at the first was perfectly capable of recreating it, when it had apostatized and rebelled. God is a sufficient cause. We do not need

to explain Christ by his natural antecedents. We grant that the absence of narrow individuality, the ideal universal manhood which we find in Christ, could never have been secured by merely natural laws of propagation. Much less, without taking into account a recreating act of God, could we explain the existence of man without sin. Here is one, holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners; one who never prays for forgiveness, but who imparts it to others; one who challenges his bitterest enemies to convince him of the least sin; one who alone of all mankind can say: "The prince of the world cometh; and he hath nothing in me"—nothing of evil desire or tendency on which his subtlest temptations can lay hold.

Now the very idea of such a man as this surpasses all human powers of invention, for men invent characters like their own. The source of it can only be in a real life once lived here upon the earth; and if that life once was lived, it must have come from God. Corrupted human nature cannot produce that which is uncorrupt. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." "Had Christ been only human nature," says Julius Müller, "he could not have been without sin; but life can draw even out of the putrescent clod materials for its own living." The new science recognizes more than one method of propagation even in the same species; and while the supernatural conception of Christ is a mystery to us, it is a mystery that well nigh explains every other mystery. The only explanation of such a humanity as Christ's is that it came from God by a new impulse of that power which created man at the beginning. And so Christ becomes not only the embodiment of all that is noble in the old humanity, but also the fountain-head and beginning of a new humanity — a new source of life for the race. Here is a new vine, whose roots are in heaven, not on earth, a vine into which the degenerate, half-withered branches of the old humanity may be grafted, so that they may have life divine. "The first Adam was made a living soul; this last Adam a life-giving Spirit." A new race takes its origin from Christ, as the old race took its start from Adam. "He shall see his seed,"—he shall be the centre and source of a new humanity. The relation of the Christian to Christ supersedes all other relationships, so that "he that loveth father or mother more than me"—that is, values more highly his natural ancestry than he values his new spiritual descent and relationship,—"is not worthy of me." Christ's human nature is a human nature that is germinal and capable of self-communication, and it constitutes him the spiritual head and beginning of a new and holy race. O, thou wonderful Savior, who hast not only life in thyself but the power of an endless life, that thou mightest be the first born among many brethren, the founder of a new city and kingdom of God, help us to see how great a thing is that humanity which thou hast taken to thyself, and the glorious possibilities of which thou hast undertaken to set forth before the universe!

Thus we have seen that the phrase "Son of man" intimates that Jesus is man, possessed of all the powers of a normal and developed humanity; that he is the ideal man, furnishing in himself the pattern which humanity is progressively to realize; and that he is the self-propagating man, who in the power of the Spirit raises up for himself a new race which shall answer to the idea of humanity as it first existed in the mind of God. But there is more than this in the phrase "Son of man." That phrase intimates also

that he is more than man. Suppose I were to go about proclaiming myself "Son of man." Who does not see that it would be mere impertinence, unless I claimed to be something more. "Son of man? But what of that? Cannot every human being call himself the same?" When one takes the title "Son of man" for his characteristic designation, as Jesus did, he implies that there is something strange in his being Son of man; that this is not his original condition and dignity; that it is condescension on his part to be Son of man. In short, when Christ calls himself Son of man, it implies that he has come from a higher level of being to inhabit this low earth of ours. And so, when we are asked "What think ye of the Christ? whose son is he?" we must answer, not simply, He is Son of man, but also, He is Son of God.

Jesus himself was conscious of this divine Sonship. Looking back into the depths of eternity past he could say: "Before Abraham was, I am;" "O, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Even here in his earthly life he is not confined to earth; he can speak of "the Son of man which is in heaven," and can say, "I and my Father are one." He exercised divine powers and prerogatives, when he said to the raging sea, "Peace, be still"; and to the troubled soul, "Thy sins be forgiven thee." John saw the evidence of Deity when Jesus showed that he "knew what was in man." Thomas saw the evidence of Deity when the resurrection-body of Christ passed through the solid walls of that upper chamber and appeared in the midst of the disciples when the doors were shut. At the beginning of Christ's ministry, Nathanael could say: "Thou art the Son of God, the King of Israel." When that ministry was half finished, Peter could say: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And after its close the beloved disciple could write: "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth."

These testimonies that Christ is the Son of God are drawn from the Scriptures. But there is proof nearer at hand, in the experience of every Christian. Every soul redeemed from sin recognizes Christ as an absolutely perfect Savior, perfectly revealing the Godhead, and worthy of unlimited worship and adoration,—that is, recognizes Christ as Deity. But Christian experience also recognizes that through Christ it has introduction and reconciliation to God as one distinct from the Son, one who was at enmity with it on account of its sin, but is now reconciled by Jesus' death. In other words, while recognizing Jesus as God, we are also compelled to recognize a distinction between the Father, and the Son through whom we come to the Father. So in like manner, when our eyes are first opened to see Christ as a Savior, we are compelled to recognize the work of a divine Spirit in us, who has taken of the things of Christ and has shown them to us, and this divine Spirit we necessarily distinguish both from the Father and from the Son. Thus the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is only a transcript of Christian experience; and the hymns and prayers of the church addressed in all ages to the Holy Spirit and to Christ, equally with the Father, are witness that this doctrine is the truth of God. Although this experience cannot be regarded as an independent witness to Jesus' claims, since it only tests the truth already made known in the Bible, still the irresistible impulse

of every person whom Christ has saved to lift his Redeemer to the highest place, and to bow before him in the lowliest worship, is strong evidence that only that interpretation of Scripture can be true which recognizes Christ's absolute Godhead.

There is one other proof that Christ is the Son of God. It is found in Christian history. The essential difference between ancient and modern civilization lies in the changed view of the relation of the individual to the state. In classic times the individual was held to exist for the sake of the state. In modern times the state exists for the sake of the individual. Then the individual had no freedom and no rights — he was but an appendage and servitor in the train of the conquering state. Now the state finds its highest glory in protecting the rights, and in securing the development, of the least and lowest of its corporate members. The dignity of woman, and the sacredness of human life, are evidences of a new spirit animating our modern civilization — a spirit utterly unknown to the most cultivated nations of antiquity. What has wrought the change? Nothing but the death of the Son of God. When it was seen that the smallest child and the lowest slave had a soul of such worth that Christ left his throne and gave up his life to save it, the world's estimate of values changed, and modern history began. And so history itself is a testimony to the Deity of Christ; for unless Christ had been felt to be infinite and divine, this change from the old to the new never could have been wrought. Is it possible that this most beneficent change in history has been the result of belief in a lie? Oh, no! Christ is the centre of history. Without him history has no order, and no philosophy of history is possible. The scattered events of the world's life-time have no meaning, until they are looked at in their relation to Jesus Christ and his kingdom. Just as the heavens were a maze and tangle till the Ptolemaic system was exchanged for one in which the sun and not the earth was the centre, so human history is an inextricable labyrinth until Christ, the Sun of righteousness, is recognized as the centre around which all persons and events revolve. Heathen and Jewish history respectively were but the negative and positive preparations for his coming. The modern world, so far as it has in it the elements of truth and righteousness, is but the outgrowth of the principles which he introduced in his incarnation, his doctrine, and his death. Nations grow in power, according as they accept his law; and more and more it is demonstrated that the kingdoms that will not serve him shall perish. For to the Son it has been said: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever."

So we have before us a wonderful twofold being, not only Son of man, but also Son of God. And now, among the lessons of the theme, let us consider, first, our need of Christ's humanity. We need a Savior that is truly man, one who will bring down God to our human understanding, one who will give us a brother's sympathy and example, one who has trod the same paths of suffering which we have to tread, one who has been tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. It is not enough for us to have a divine Redeemer. It is not enough for us to have a Redeemer whose humanity is merely nominal. There was an old patristic notion that Christ's humanity, in union with his deity, was like a drop of honey mingled with the ocean; but it was rightly judged heretical, for it was as much as to say that the hu-

manity of Christ is so swallowed up in his deity as to be altogether lost. We need to maintain the unchanged and perfect humanity of our Lord, as much as we do the unchanged and perfect divinity. The ages when the church has lost sight of the humanity have been ages of the greatest declension in doctrine and practice. One of the greatest pictures in the world, Michael Angelo's tremendous fresco of the Last Judgment, in the Sistine Chapel at Rome, is an illustration of that declension. How well I remember the day when its awful grandner first rose before me! On the left, I seem still to see the dead rising from their graves and making their way to meet the Judge. Righteous and wicked alike come before him. The martyrs come, bringing the instruments of their martyrdom, as evidences of their love for their Lord. There is St. Sebastian, with the arrows with which he was pierced; there is St. Catherine with the wheel on which the body was broken. Heavenly messengers bear aloft Christ's crown of thorns, the nails that were driven through his hands and feet, the pillar to which he was chained when they scourged him, the cross upon which he hung during those long hours of agony,— all these as pledges of salvation for the saints, but as swift witnesses against the wicked. The wicked come despairing before their Judge; and, as they receive their doom, they pass downward and are caught by fiends and devils. And who is the Judge? A wrathful Jupiter, with no trace of human compassion upon his brow, but grasping thunderbolts and hurling them against his foes. So Michael Angelo pictured Christ! But the most striking and fearful feature of the picture is the presence of the Virgin Mary, at her Son's right hand, and the turning of her head away from the condemned. That the merciful mother of our Lord should refuse to interfere in their behalf, is the last element in the cup of the misery of the wicked. See what resulted from forgetting the humanity of Jesus! Men must have a compassionate and tender being, to intercede for them. So they elevated the Virgin to the place of Christ, and made her the only advocate for sinners. To call Christ only God, is as pernicious an error as to call him only man. When men ignore the merciful and faithful High-priest, who can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, they fall into the worship of Mary and the invocation of the saints. When men deny the living human Christ, who is with us alway unto the end of the world, they must have some substitute, and they find it— oh, how poor and mean! — in the "real presence" of the wafer and the mass.

We need Christ's humanity — that is the first lesson. But there is a second. It is this: We need Christ's divinity also. For only as Christ is divine, can he make an infinite atonement for us. There is a debt to be paid, which we can never pay ourselves,— a reparation to be made, which we can never render. Every soul convinced of sin, feels that none but an infinite Redeemer can ever save it. God must suffer, if man is to go free. He could not suffer, if he were only God. He can suffer, because he is not only God, but also man. Just as my soul could never suffer the pains of fire, if it were only soul, but can suffer those pains in union with the body; so the otherwise impassible God can suffer mortal pangs, through his union with humanity, which he never could suffer, if he had not joined himself to our nature. There is such a union with humanity — a union so close that Deity itself is brought under the curse and penalty of the law. Shall we say

with John of Damascus, that, as the man who fells a tree does no harm to the subeams that illuminate it, so the blows that struck Christ's humanity caused no pain to his Deity? On the contrary, it was the very greatness of his Deity that made his agony ineffable. Because Christ was God, did he pass unscorched through the fires of Gethsemane and Calvary? Ah, rather say, because Christ was God, he underwent a suffering which was absolutely infinite. In that infinite suffering, we see the cup of God's just indignation drunk to the very dregs; the otherwise unappeasable demands of violated conscience satisfied. Christ's flesh is meat indeed, and Christ's blood is drink indeed! Because Christ is God, his atonement is sufficient. Because he is God, the union which he effects with God is complete. If he were only man or angel, he would still be finite; the gulf between him and God would still be infinite; he never could bring us nearer to God than he was himself. But since he is God, he is able to bring us to the very holy of holies, to the very heart of God, to living union with the Father of our spirits; nay, in him we become partakers of the divine nature, one spirit with the Lord — we dwelling in God, and God dwelling in us; an indissoluble and eternal fellowship with the Father and with the Son and with the Holy Ghost. We need his humanity,— but ah, what should we do without his Deity? A human Savior alone can never reconcile nor re-unite me to God. But a divine Savior can.

> "Jesus, my God! I know his name,
> His name is all my trust;
> Nor will he put my soul to shame,
> Nor let my hope be lost."

Yes, he has both — the human sympathy and the divine power — and he has them now. And here is the third lesson: We need this humanity and this deity perfectly and eternally united in the one person of our Lord. And so it is. Christ did not take human nature, as some of those Indian gods are fabled to have done. The Hindoo avatars were only tempory unions of deity with humanity, and after that humanity had been drawn for a little time into the the brightness of the godhead, it was cast aside, as a worn out garment, and Buddha returned alone to his heaven. How different is the union of humanity with Deity in Christ! Forever stands our humanity in heaven. It has ascended the throne of the universe. It has entered into the partnership of the Trinity. It is the pledge and earnest of our glorification. We too shall reign with Christ; we shall judge angels; "round about his throne," in the striking language of the Revised Version, "are four and twenty thrones," on which the representatives of the redeemed shall sit; and all things shall be ours, because we are Christ's, and Christ is God's. Let us not lose the blessing of this great truth, that Christ has taken our whole humanity with him, and that there in heaven he still has the pierced hands and feet that were nailed to the bitter cross for us. There he has a human soul, now capable of divine love and intervention in our behalf. There he has a human body, of wonderful beauty and of wonderful powers, the model and the pledge of our resurrection-body. Everything that took place in Christ shall take place in us. He wrought nothing for himself alone, but all for the race of which he became a part. "For he that sanctifieth, and that they are sanctified are all of one," — of one body, I think the

meaning is, — "for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." "Therefore our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself."

We need his humanity; we need his Deity; we need this humanity and this Deity united in one person. But there is a last lesson: We need to recognize this humanity and this Deity, and to recognize them now. When a beggar girl is taken by a king to be his bride, she does well to reflect, not only upon the greatness of his love, but also upon the return of love she owes to him. How infinite the debt we owe to Christ! How infinite the honor of serving him! To be the servant of such a Lord — this is to be higher than the kings of the earth! No human being ever reaches so high a place as when he prostrates himself absolutely at the feet of Jesus, and lays there all that he is and all that he has forever. It is a mark of Paul's progress in Christian experience that in his later epistles he ceases to call himself "apostle of Jesus Christ," and designates himself simply as "Christ's servant." In his earlier letters, it is "Paul, apostle of Jesus Christ;" in the later, it is: "Paul, a servant a bond-servant, a slave — of Jesus Christ." So he followed Christ's own example, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister; not to be served, but to serve. Let us all consecrate ourselves to the same blessed service. When every Christian shall be in reality what the Pope of Rome in one of his titles professes to be — "a servant of servants" for Jesus' sake — then the world shall recognize the glory of him who is Son of man and Son of God.

"Oh, not to fill the mouth of fame
My longing heart is stirred;
Oh, give me a diviner name,
Call me thy servant, Lord!

"Sweet title that delighteth me,
Name earnestly implored;
Oh, what can reach the dignity
Of thy true servant, Lord!

"No longer would my soul be known
As self-sustained and free;
Oh, not my own, oh, not my own —
Lord, I belong to thee!"

Serve Christ, and he will reveal himself to you. The path of service is the path of knowledge. You shall see this Son of man and Son of God, when you once begin to obey him. For he himself has said: "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, * * * and I will love him and will manifest myself to him." A few years ago in one of our eastern cities there lived a physician of eminence, whose practice among the sick and the suffering had given him a large experience of the miseries of the world. He was one of those who are sometimes said constitutionally to be doubters, and his doubts turned upon the person and the work of Christ. He could see the beauty of Christ's character, but the possibility of Deity being united with humanity in him he could not see. He could see the attractiveness of the Christian scheme — Christ putting his own mighty shoulders under all our load of sin and penalty, and bearing the burden that

we might go free — but the possibility of this he could not understand. And so he went on, the opportunities for religious service in his profession putting his conscience under a heavier and heavier load of obligation, but his speculative doubts growing thicker and thicker, until it sometimes seemed to him as if all the lights of heaven had gone out. One day he met an evangelical minister in whom he had confidence, and with the first word the trouble of his soul was made known. "I have had the greatest trial of my life this morning." "How so?" replied his friend. "Why, I have just been to the bedside of a poor woman who has but a few hours to live, and as I was standing there it suddenly flashed upon my mind that her soul was in worse case than her body — she seemed the very image of conscious guilt and despair. And, do you know? it seemed to me at that moment that, if I believed as you do in Christ, it would have been a great privilege to kneel down by her bedside and to commend the poor woman to his mercy." "Oh, my friend!" said the minister, "God has put that into your heart. Follow that impulse. We will not stop to settle the question who and what Christ is. You know that somewhere in the universe Christ lives — his life did not go out in darkness like an extinguished taper. And he is true — he said that he would hear men's prayers, whenever they called upon him. And he is more able now, than he was when he heard the poor blind beggar's cry. Go back to that bedside, and God go with you!" And the resolve was taken. The physician went once more into that sick room, and there for the first time in all his life he knelt in prayer to Jesus. He prayed Christ to teach that poor woman's soul the way to God. But as he prayed, Christ taught his soul the way to God. The one act of recognizing and obeying Christ was the door through which Christ himself entered into his heart, and in the consciousness that Christ had forgiven his sins and saved his soul he could doubt no longer about Christ's divinity, but he fell at Christ's feet like Thomas, crying "My Lord and my God!"

Oh, friend to whom I speak! I pray you to recognize Christ now! This particular message from God will never come to you — the preacher you may never see — again.

> "We twain have met like ships upon the sea —
> Who hold an hour's converse — so short, so sweet;
> One little hour, and then away they speed,
> On lonely paths, through mist and cloud and foam,
> To meet no more."

Ah! I mistake, we *shall* meet, not many months and years from now, — shall meet before the throne of that once crucified, now crowned and sceptred Savior, once known only in his character as Son of man, then known chiefly in his character as Son of God. Be thankful that it is yet one of the days of the Son of man. Listen to me, while I urge you to recognize him now as Son of God. Now you may think that you do not need him; but then you will see that you have no other need. Now, death and eternity may seem far away; but then, they will be the overmastering facts of your experience. When I was a mere child I remember riding from the city of my residence toward the great lake that skirts our State upon the north. I remember the first distant momentary glimpse of its far line of blue, and the feeling of mystery and awe which that glimpse inspired within

me. From the summit of the last hill-top as we pressed onward, I remember the yet more solemn feeling with which I looked upon the great waters that stretched away before me, now so deep and cold, so fathomless and illimitable. But when we came down to the water's edge and I was led out into the rolling waves, there seemed to be nothing but the sea — the solid shore had vanished. I was overwhelmed and lost, but for my father's voice lifted up to encourage, and my father's hand stretched out to hold me up. So as we go in the journey of life, as youth grows into manhood and manhood into age, death and eternity assume larger and larger significance. The first distant glimpse of them may overawe the soul, but the final stepping down into the flood is a unique experience — it cannot be anticipated. But to him who has recognized Christ as Son of man and Son of God, death has no terrors; for Christ himself has said: "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee, and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee." Death may be mighty, but Christ is the Conqueror of death, and his pierced right hand can help us through the flood and open to us the gates of Paradise upon the other side. And therefore, in life, in death, on earth, in heaven, this Christ, Son of God and Son of man, is the only hope of me, a sinner; and to you, my fellow-sinner, bound with me to his judgment seat, I commend this Christ as the one and only Savior, and pray you in his stead that you accept him and be saved. "What think ye of the Christ? Whose son is he?" God grant that every one of us may reply: "He is the Son of man and Son of God, my Redeemer and my King!

"Happy, if with my latest breath
I may but gasp his name;
Preach him to all, and cry in death:
'Behold, behold the Lamb!'"

XVI.

THE NECESSITY OF THE ATONEMENT.*

In these words of our Lord, which I read from the Revised Version, we find plainly asserted the necessity of his atonement. They are still better translated in the Bible Union Version which reads: "Was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer these things?" Why was it needful that Christ should suffer? In order that prophecy might be fulfilled? Yes,— but why were Christ's sufferings matters of prophecy? It must be because they were included in the purpose of God — the purpose of God to redeem the world. Why could not the world be redeemed without the sufferings of Christ? There are two answers to be given to this question. First, because there is an ethical principle in God's nature which demands that sin shall be punished. The holiness of God requires satisfaction for sin, and Christ's penal sufferings furnish that satisfaction. Secondly, because Christ stands in such a relation to humanity that what God's holiness demands, Christ is under obligation to pay, longs to pay, inevitably does pay, and pays so fully, in virtue of his twofold nature, that every claim of justice is satisfied and the sinner who accepts what he has done in his behalf is saved.

With regard to the first of these aspects of the atonement — its necessity as regards God — so much is said in Scripture that little room is left for doubt or ambiguity. In his sacrifice, Christ offers himself through the eternal Spirit without spot to God. He is set forth in his blood as a propitiatory sacrifice, so that God may be just and yet justify him that believes. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission, but the blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin, for he is the propitiation for our sins and not for ours only but for the sins of the whole world. These passages declare that the righteousness of God demands an atonement if sinners are to be saved.

It is to the second and more difficult aspect of the atonement — its necessity as regards Christ himself — that I wish to direct special attention. Many who can see how God can justly demand satisfaction, cannot see how Christ can justly make it. The suffering of the innocent in place of the guilty seems to them manifestly unjust. They recognize no obligation on the part of Christ to suffer. I am persuaded that light can be thrown upon this particular point in the great doctrine. We shall understand the necessity of Christ's sufferings, when we consider what Christ was, and what were his relations to the race.

What were the results to Christ of his union with humanity? I shall mention three. The first was obligation to suffer for men; since, being one

* A sermon upon the text, Luke 24:26—"Behoved it not the Christ to suffer these things?"

with the race, he had a share in the responsibility of the race to the law and the justice of God — a responsibility not destroyed by his purification in the womb of the Virgin. There is an organic unity of the race. All that there is of humanity has descended from one common stock. In our first parents that humanity fell from holiness and incurred the great displeasure of God, and each member of the race since that time has been born into the state into which our first parents fell. The universal prevalence of perverse affections, and the universal reign of death, are evidences that the whole race is under the curse. What were the two main consequences of sin to Adam? They were first, depravity, and secondly, guilt. First the corruption of his own nature; and secondly, obligation to endure the penal wrath of God. What are the two consequences to us of Adam's sin? Precisely the same: first, depravity; secondly, guilt. We are born depraved, or with natures continually tending to sin; we are born guilty, or under God's displeasure and justly bound to suffer. And so because of this race-unity and race-responsibility we bear a thousand ills not due to our individual and conscious transgressions, and even infants, who have never in their own persons violated a single command of God, do notwithstanding suffer and die.

Now if Christ had been born into the world like other men, he too would have had both these burdens to bear,— first, the burden of depravity, and secondly, the burden of guilt. But with regard to the first, he was not born into the world like other men. In the womb of the Virgin, the human nature which he took was purged of its depravity even at the instant of his taking it, so that it could be said to Mary: "That holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God," and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews could speak of Christ as "holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners." With regard to the second consequence of sin, however, Christ was born into the world like other men. The purging away of all depravity did not take away guilt, in the sense of just exposure to the penalties of violated law. Although Christ's nature was purified, his obligation to suffer yet remained. All the sorrows of his earthly life, and all the pains of death which he endured, were evidences that justice still held him to answer for the common sin of the race.

The justice of Christ's sufferings has been illustrated by the obligation of the silent partner of a business firm to pay debts which he did not personally contract; or by the obligation of the husband to pay the debts of his wife; or by the obligation of a purchasing country to assume the debts of the province which it purchases. There have been men who have spent the strength of a life-time in clearing off the indebtedness of an insolvent father long since deceased. They recognized an organic unity of the family which made their father's liabilities their own. So Christ recognized the organic unity of the race, and saw that, having become one of the sinning race, he had involved himself in all its liabilities, even to the suffering of death, the great penalty of sin. He might have declined to join himself to humanity, and then he need not have suffered. He might have sundered his connection with the race, and then he need not have suffered. But once born of the Virgin, and possessed of the human nature that was under the curse, he was bound to suffer. The whole mass and weight of God's displeasure against the race fell on him, when once he became a member of the race.

It was this that Jesus chiefly shrank from when he prayed that the cup might pass from him. And when at last God's face was hidden from the sufferer, and he cried in agony :—"My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!" there would have been no sting in death if it had not been the wages of sin, justly paid to him who not only stood in the sinner's place, but who was made sin for us in the sense of being guilty of the original sin of the race, while yet he was utterly free from inherited depravity or personal transgression.

It has been common enough for theologians to recognize an imputed guilt, as furnishing an explanation of Christ's sufferings. The poet says :

> "My soul looks back to see
> The burdens thou didst bear
> When hanging on the accursed tree,
> And hopes her guilt was there."

But this imputation of others' guilt is very difficult to reason, even when helped out by John Miller's hypothesis of Christ's federal relation to the race. The doctrine of the atonement needs something more than this to make it comprehensible. It needs such an actual union of Christ with humanity and such a derivation of the substance of his being by natural generation from Adam as will make him, not simply the constructive heir, but the natural heir, of the guilt of the race. Edward Irving saw this, and he declared therefore that Christ took human nature as it was in Adam, not before the fall, but after the fall. But he ignored the qualification that, in his taking it, that human nature was completely purified by the Holy Spirit, and so he taught that Christ's humanity was depraved. The true doctrine is that the humanity of Christ was not a new creation, but was derived from Adam through Mary his mother. Christ, then, so far as his humanity was concerned, was in Adam just as we were, and, as Adam's descendant, he was responsible for Adam's sin like every other member of the race ; the chief difference being that, while we inherit from Adam both guilt and depravity, he whom the Holy Spirit purified, inherited not the depravity but only the guilt.

The first effect upon Christ of his union with humanity, then, was that it put him under obligation to suffer for the sins of men. But there was a second effect — it was the longing to suffer which perfect love to God must feel, in view of the demands upon the race of that holiness of God which he loved more than he loved the race itself ; which perfect love to man must feel, in view of the fact that bearing the penalty of man's sin was the only way to save him. I have spoken of Christ's shrinking from suffering and death because it was the penalty of sin. But this is perfectly consistent with an intense longing to pay that penalty, as it was the demand of infinite righteousness. That righteousness he loved, more than he loved the whole universe besides. That righteousness he saw to be the only worthy object of adoration for the universe — the only security for the peace of the universe. He understood the requisitions of righteousness, as only one who was perfectly pure could understand them. And when that righteousness presented its demands to him as a member of the condemned and guilty race, there was that in him which moved him to respond : "Let that righteousness be exalted, though I die!"

Think how urgent the demand of conscience sometimes is, even in the case of sinful men, and you will get some idea of the yearning of Christ's pure heart to offer his great sacrifice. All great masters in literature have recognized it. The inextinguishable thirst for reparation constitutes the very essence of tragedy. Marguerite in Goethe's Faust, fainting in the great Cathedral under the solemn reverberations of the "*Dies Iræ;*" Dimmesdale in Hawthorne's Scarlet Letter, putting himself side by side with Hester Prynne, his victim, in her place of obloquy; Bulwer's Eugene Aram, coming forward, though unsuspected, to confess the murder he had committed, all these are illustrations of the inner impulse that moves even a sinful soul to satisfy the claims of justice upon it.

Nor are these cases confined to the pages of romance. That was an unusual and exciting scene in a Plattsburg court-room, near the close of a trial for murder. The murderer was a life-convict who had struck down a fellow-convict with an axe. The jury, after being out two hours, came in to ask the judge to explain the difference between murder in the first, and murder in the second, degree. Suddenly the prisoner arose and said: "This was not murder in second degree. It was a deliberate and premeditated murder. I know that I have done wrong, that I ought to confess the truth, and that I ought to be hanged." This left the jury nothing to do but to render their verdict, and the judge sentenced the murderer to be hanged, as he deserved to be. The other case of Earl, the wife-murderer, is still fresh in public recollection. Earl thanked the jury that had convicted him, declared the verdict just, begged that no one would interfere to stay the course of justice, said that the greatest blessing that could be conferred upon him would be to let him suffer the penalty of his crime. Now, if wicked men can be moved with such desire to suffer, how much more must he desire to suffer whose sympathy with the righteousness of God was perfect and complete. For man's sake Christ longed to suffer, because only through his suffering could man be saved. But chiefly for God's sake Christ longed to suffer, for only through his suffering could God's righteousness be vindicated. Hence we see him pressing forward to the cross with such majestic determination that the disciples were amazed and afraid. Hence we hear him saying — "With desire have I desired to drink this cup;" "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it is accomplished." Here is the truth in Campbell's theory of the Atonement. Christ is the great Penitent before God — making confession of the sin of the race, which others of that race could neither see nor feel. But the view which I present is a larger and completer one than that of Campbell, in that it makes this confession and reparation obligatory upon Christ, as Campbell's view does not, and recognizes the penal nature of Christ's sufferings, which Campbell's view denies.

There is but one point further. I have shown that Christ's sufferings were necessary, first, because he was under obligation to suffer; and secondly, because his love to God and man made him long to discharge this obligation. Now, thirdly, I would show, that, being such as he was, he could not help suffering — in other words, the obligatory and the desired were also the inevitable. Since he was a being of perfect purity, contact with the sin of the race, of which he was a member, necessarily involved an actual suffering of an intenser kind than we can conceive. There are

moments in our own experience when the wickedness of some past misdeed is revealed to us in a light so appalling, that we get some conception of what hell must be to the everlastingly condemned. There are moments when our unbelief and ingratitude seem abhorrent and shocking beyond description. There are times when the sin of others to whom we are closely bound, their disregard of Christ and his claims, their grieving of his Spirit, affect us so deeply that the remorse which they ought to feel seems to take possession of us. So the parents feel, whose daughter has gone astray,— they identify themselves with her, feel her shame as if it were their own, cannot absolve themselves from the feeling of responsibility. And there are men whose hearts are so large and deep, that they feel thus for the sin and misery of the world. They look upon the bonds of their brethren, and feel bound with them, as Moses identified himself with his suffering people in Egypt. And this suffering in and with the sins of men, which Dr. Bushnell emphasized so strongly, though it is not, as he thought, the principal element, is notwithstanding an indispensable element, in the atonement of Christ.

In the last illness of John Woolman, one of the early members of the Society of Friends, he gave utterance to the following words. They are in the form of an address to God: "O Lord, my God, the amazing horrors of darkness were gathered about me and covered me all over, and I saw no way to go forth; I felt the depth and extent of the misery of my fellow creatures separated from the divine harmony, and it was greater than I could bear, and I was crushed down under it; I lifted up my hand, I stretched out my arm, but there was none to help me; I looked round about and was amazed. In the depths of misery, O Lord, I remembered that thou art omnipotent, that I had called thee Father, and I felt that I loved thee, and I was made quiet in thy will, and I waited for deliverance from thee; thou hadst pity upon me when no man could help me. I saw that meekness under suffering was showed to me in the most affecting example of thy Son, and thou wast teaching me to follow him, and I said: 'Thy will, O Father, be done.'" He had vision of a "dull, gloomy mass" darkening half the heavens, and which he was told was "human beings, in as great misery as they could be and live; and he was mixed with them, and henceforth he might not consider himself a distinct and separate being."

Sin is self-isolating, and its watchword is: "Am I my brother's keeper?" But love and righteousness have in them the instinct of human unity. Nothing human is foreign to the man who lives in God. We do not know how completely a perfectly holy being, possessed of superhuman knowledge and love, may have felt even the pangs of remorse for the condition of that humanity of which he was the central conscience and heart. Such a holy being was Christ. In him all the nerves and sensibilities of humanity met. He was the only healthy member of the race. He could feel the condition of humanity, when no other member of the race could feel it. When a man has been exposed to intense cold and his limbs are frozen, he feels no pain, but rather the disposition to sleep, even though he knows this sleep will be the sleep of death. But bring the man to the fire, thaw the frozen limbs, and the first return of circulation is accompanied by exquisite pain. Pain is the very sign of life. So Christ was the only sensitive and healthy member of a benumbed and stupefied humanity. His soul felt all the pangs

of shame and suffering which rightfully belonged to sinners, but which they could not feel, just by reason of the depth and depravity of their sin. Because Christ was pure, therefore he must suffer. Not because of what he was in himself, but because of what the race was to which he had united himself, "it must needs be that Christ should suffer." As he was God, he could be the proper substitute for others; as he was man, the penalty due to human guilt belonged to him to bear.

I have already alluded to the great proof-text which Paul gives us; let me a little more fully elucidate it. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, the fifth chapter and the twenty-first verse, we read: "Him who knew no sin, he made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him." The two members of the sentence stand in contrast to each other; the evident meaning of the one may teach us something with regard to the meaning of the other. "Righteousness" here cannot mean subjective purity, for then "made to be sin" would mean that God made Christ to be subjectively depraved. As Christ was not made *unholy*, the meaning cannot be that we are made *holy* persons in him. Our "becoming the righteousness of God in him" can only mean that we became justified persons in Christ. Correspondingly, Christ's "being made sin" must mean that he is made to be a condemned person "on our behalf." When the text speaks of "him who knew no sin," it declares that Christ was not personally a sinner — this was the necessary prerequisite of his work of atonement. When the text says he was "made to be sin on our behalf," it declares also that he was made a sinner, in the sense that the penalty of sin fell upon him.

But not simply penalty — the text declares that guilt was his also. For, justification is not simply the remisson of *actual* punishment, but is also the deliverance from the *obligation* to suffer punishment, and as "righteousness" means "persons delivered from the guilt as well as the penalty of sin," so the contrasted term "sin" in the text means "a person not only actually punished, but also under obligation to suffer punishment"; in other words, Christ is "made sin," not only in the sense of being put under *penalty*, but also in the sense of being put under *guilt*.

How was this guilt put upon Christ? The same text intimates the answer. It was by Christ's becoming one with our race. As Adam's sin is ours only because we are actually one with Adam, and as Christ's righteousness is imputed to us only as we are actually united to Christ, so our sin is imputed to Christ only as Christ becomes actually one with the race. He was "made sin," by being made one with the sinners; he took our guilt by taking our nature. He "who knew no sin" came to be "sin for us," by being born of a sinful stock; by inheritance the common guilt of the race became his. Guilt was not simply imputed to Christ; it was imparted also. As we become justified persons by taking part in his new and redeemed nature, so he was made guilty for us by taking our condemned nature in the womb of the Virgin. Thus, having our guilt, he can atone; by virtue of his divine nature, he can exhaust the penalty of sin and be our substitute; becoming justified himself, he can make all believers partakers of his justification.

In this doctrine of the atonement, I see the only vindication of the justice

of God. On any theory of mere human martyrdom, on any theory of mere human sympathy, God would seem to be unjust. That the holiest man of all the ages should have been the greatest sufferer, impugns God's justice, and fills me with terror and despair. But if Christ stood in the place of sinners, and bore the guilt of the race to which he had united himself, then in his suffering I see the greatest possible proof of the divine righteousness — righteousness that will maintain itself even at the cost of the suffering and death of the Son of God. Yes, in the cross I see the glory of God's righteousness — the Judge himself coming down from his judicial tribunal and taking the sinner's place, rather than that one jot or tittle of the law should fail. If God so honored his own righteousness, how ought we to honor it!

In this doctrine of the atonement I see the only way of escape for the sinner. I once tried to tell a convicted sinner about Christ's power to renew his heart. But he replied: "That is not what I want — there is first a debt that I must pay. I must make up for my past sins." That is the utterance of the unsophisticated heart, when God's Spirit enlightens it. It must have atonement, before renewal. It must see some reparation made, before it can begin the work of reformation. It was a great delight to me to tell that man that his debts had been paid by Christ; that the reparation had been made upon the cross; and that now, "nothing, either great or small, remained for him to do," but only to take what Christ had done for him. Yes, it was needful for Christ to suffer, if any sinner was ever to be saved. But now Christ has suffered once for all. "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities. The chastisement of our peace was upon him," and, thank God! "by his stripes we are healed." The worst of sinners, who believes in Jesus, can say in the language of Toplady's hymn:—

"From whence this fear and unbelief?
Hast thou, O Father, put to grief
Thy spotless Son for me?
And will the righteous Judge of men
Condemn me for that debt of sin
Which, Lord, was laid on thee?

"If thou hast my discharge procured,
And freely in my room endured
The whole of wrath divine,
Payment God cannot twice demand
First at my bleeding Surety's hand,
And then again at mine.

"Complete atonement thou hast made,
And to the utmost farthing paid
Whate'er thy people owed;
How then can wrath on me take place,
If sheltered in thy righteousness
And sprinkled with thy blood?

"Turn then, my soul, unto thy rest
The merits of thy great High Priest
Speak peace and liberty;
Trust in his efficacious blood;
Nor fear thy banishment from God,
Since Jesus died for thee"!

XVII.

THE BELIEVER'S UNION WITH CHRIST.*

It is strange that a doctrine which Dr. J. W. Alexander called "the central truth of all theology and of all religion" should receive so little of formal recognition either in dogmatic treatises or in ordinary religious experience. In Dr. A. A. Hodge's *Outlines of Theology* a brief chapter is devoted to it, to which I am greatly indebted, and to which I refer the reader. The majority of printed systems of doctrine, however, contain no chapter or section with the title of the present article at its head; and the majority of Christians much more frequently think of Christ as a Savior outside of them, than as a Savior who dwells within. There can be little doubt that the comparative neglect with which this truth of the believer's union with his Lord is visited, is a reaction from the exaggerations of a false mysticism. It is no less true that there is crying need of rescuing the doctrine from neglect. I attempt the present brief and fragmentary treatment of a vast and sublime theme, from no conceit of my ability to compass it, but from a profound conviction that, ignored though it so commonly is, it is the most important of topics, not only for these times, but for all times.

Doctrines which reason can neither discover nor prove, need large support from the Bible. It is a mark of divine wisdom that the doctrine of the Trinity, for example, is so interwoven with the whole fabric of the New Testament, that the rejection of the former is the virtual rejection of the latter. The doctrine of Union with Christ, in like manner, is taught so variously and abundantly, that to deny it is to deny inspiration itself. There is figurative teaching, and there are direct statements. The union of the believer with his Savior is illustrated from the union of a building and its foundation,— each living stone in the Christian temple is kept in proper relation to every other, and made to do its part in furnishing a habitation for God, only by being built upon and permanently connected with Christ, the chief corner-stone. It is illustrated by the indissoluble bond that connects husband and wife, and makes them legally and organically one. The vine and its branches are used to convey some proper idea of it,— as God's natural life is in the vine, that it may give life to its natural branches, so God's spiritual life is in the vine Christ, that he may give life to his spiritual branches. The members of the human body are united to the head, as the source of their activity and the power that controls their movements,— so all believers are members of an invisible body, whose animating and directing head is Christ. The whole race is one with the first man Adam, in whom it fell and from whom it has derived a corrupted and guilty nature,— so the whole race of

* Printed in the Examiner, June 12, 1879.

believers constitute a new and restored humanity whose justified and purified nature is derived from Christ, the second Adam, the atoning Savior.

But lest we should regard these striking analogies as mere orientalisms of speech, to be interpreted only as high-flown metaphors, the New Testament asserts in the most direct and prosaic manner the fact of this union. The believer is said to be "in Christ," as the element or atmosphere which surrounds him with its perpetual presence, and which constitutes his vital breath; in fact, the phrase "in Christ," always meaning "in union with Christ," is the very key to Paul's Epistles and to the whole Scripture of the new dispensation. Christ is also said to be in the believer, and so to live his life within the believer, that the latter can point to this as the dominating fact of his experience,— it is not so much he that lives, as it is Christ that lives in him. The Father and the Son dwell in the believer, for where the Son is, there always the Father must be also. The believer has life by partaking of Christ, in a way that may not inappropriately be compared with Christ's having life by partaking of the Father. All believers are one in Christ, to whom they are severally and collectively united, as Christ himself is one with God. So close and complete is this union, that by it the believer is made partaker of the divine nature, and becomes one spirit with the Lord. And yet these are but a few of the statements of this great fact, with which the New Testament abounds.

It should not surprise us, if we find it far more difficult to give a scientific definition of this union, than to determine the fact of its existence. It is a fact of life with which we have to deal; and the secret of life, even in its lowest forms, no philospher has ever yet discovered. The tiniest crocus that lifts its head in the spring-time witnesses to two facts: first, that of its relative independence as an individual organism; and secondly, that of its ultimate dependence upon a life and power higher than its own. So every human soul has its proper powers of intellect, affection and will,— yet it lives, moves and has its being in God. Starting out from the truth of the divine omnipresence, it might seem as if God's indwelling in the granite boulder was the last limit of his union with the finite. But we see the divine intelligence and goodness drawing nearer to us by successive stages in vegetable life, in the animal creation, and in the moral nature of man. And yet there are two stages beyond all these: first, in Christ's union with the believer, and secondly, in God's union with Christ. If this union of Christ with the believer be only one of several approximations of God to his finite creation, the fact that it is, equally with the others, not wholly comprehensible to reason, should not blind us either to its truth or to its importance.

Facts with regard to life, we must often define by negatives. And so it is here. We guard the truth from misconception, and cut off the claims of errorists of many schools, when we declare that this union with Christ of which the Scriptures speak, is not a merely natural union, like that of God with all human spirits, as is generally maintained by rationalists; nor a merely moral union, as Socinians and Arminians declare; nor a union which destroys the distinct personality and subsistence of either Christ or the human spirit, as many of the Mystics have believed; nor a union mediated and conditioned by the sacraments of the church — as is held by Romanists, Lutherans, and High Church Episcopalians. But we do not deal in nega-

tives alone. We may put our doctrine into positive statement also. The Scripture teaches that, by faith, there is constituted a union of the soul with Christ different in kind from God's natural and providential concurrence with all spirits, as well as from all unions of mere association or sympathy, moral likeness or moral influence — a union of life, in which the human spirit, while then most truly possessing its own individuality and personal distinctness, is interpenetrated and energized by the Spirit of Christ, is made inscrutably and indissolubly one with him, and so becomes a member and partaker of that new, regenerated, believing, and justified humanity of which he is the head.

Still a few words of explanation are possible and requisite. The union is an organic one. By it we are constituted members of Christ's spiritual body, partakers of his purified and glorified human nature. As every portion of a true organism is reciprocally means and end, so, while Christ the head lives for the members, the members also live for Christ the head. It is a vital union, in distinction from any union of mere juxtaposition or of external influence. Christ does not work upon us from without, as one separated from us, but from within, as the very heart from which the life-blood of our spirits flows. He is the source, not simply of motives and of moral suasion, but of vital energy and spiritual strength. Such a union, not of natural but of spiritual life, cannot be mediated by sacraments, since sacraments presuppose it as already existing. Only faith receives and retains Christ; and faith is the act of the soul grasping what is purely invisible and supersensible, not the act of the body submitting to baptism or partaking of the Supper. Once formed, the union is indissoluble. Since there is now an unchangeable and divine element in us, our salvation depends no longer upon our unstable wills, but upon Him, who has said that none shall pluck us out of his hand. By temporary declension from duty or by our causeless unbelief, we may banish Christ to the barest and most remote room of the soul's house, but he does not suffer us wholly to exclude him, and when we are willing to unbar the doors, he is still there, ready to fill the whole mansion with his light and love. This union is inscrutable, indeed, but it is not mystical, in the sense of being unintelligible to the Christian or beyond the reach of his experience. If we call it mystical at all, it should be only because, in the intimacy of its communion and the transforming power of its influence, it surpasses any other union of souls that we know, and so cannot be fully described or understood by earthly analogies.

Such is the nature of union with Christ,— such, I mean, is the nature of every believer's union with Christ. For, whether he knows it or not, every Christian has entered into just such a partnership as this. It is this and this only which constitutes him a Christian, and which makes possible a Christian church. We may, indeed, be thus united to Christ, without being fully conscious of the real nature of our relation to him. We may actually possess the kernel while as yet we have paid regard only to the shell,— we may seem to ourselves to be united to Christ only by an external bond, while after all it is an inward and spiritual bond that makes us his. God often reveals to the Christian the mystery of the gospel, which is Christ *in* him the hope of glory, at the very time that he is seeking only some nearer access to a Redeemer outside of him. Trying to find a union of coöperation

or of sympathy, he is amazed to learn that there is already established a union with Christ more glorious and blessed, namely, a union of life; and so, like the miners of the Rocky Mountains, while he is looking only for silver, he finds gold. Christ and the believer have the same life. They are not separate persons linked together by some temporary bond of friendship — they are united by a tie as close and indissoluble as if the same blood ran in their veins. Yet the Christian may never have suspected how intimate a union he has with his Savior, and the first understanding of this truth may be the gateway through which he passes into a holier and happier stage of the Christian life.

Theology finds its focus in this truth of union with Christ; and from it, as from a central mount of observation, the true meaning and relations of all other doctrines may be best discerned. The nature of our relation to Adam, in whom the old humanity as an organic unit fell, can be understood only in the light of our relation to Christ, in whom the new humanity, in its principle and germ, atoned for sin and wrought out a perfect righteousness. The atonement itself, in the aspect of it which is most difficult to reason, the just suffering for others of one who was personally innocent, has more light reflected upon it from this doctrine of our union with Christ than from any other. There is a race-responsibility which belongs to every descendant of Adam, and this race-responsibility is distinguishable from personal responsibility. Christ's corporate union with humanity involved him in that race-responsibility, and so, though he was personally pure, law could lay her penalties upon the head of our Redeemer. Christ took our guilt when he took our nature; he has delivered us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us.

But atonement is not enough. The atonement makes full satisfaction to divine justice and removes all external obstacles to man's return to God. But an internal obstacle still remains — the evil affections and will, and the consequent guilt, of the individual soul. This last obstacle Christ removes, in the case of all his people, by uniting himself to them in a closer and more perfect manner than that in which he is united to humanity at large. As Christ's union with the race secures the objective reconciliation of the race to God, so Christ's union with believers secures the subjective reconciliation of believers to God. As Christ's union with us involves atonement, so our union with Christ involves justification. The believer is entitled to take for his own all that Christ is and all that Christ has done, and this because he has within him that new life of humanity which suffered in Christ's death and rose from the grave in Christ's resurrection,— in other words, because he is virtually one person with his Redeemer. And so Luther declares: "By faith thou art so glued to Christ that of thee and him there becomes as it were one person, so that with confidence thou canst say: 'I am Christ — that is, Christ's righteousness, victory, *etc.*, are mine;' and Christ in turn can say: 'I am that sinner — that is, his sins, his death, *etc.*, are mine, because he clings to me and I to him, for we have been joined together through faith into one flesh and bone.'"

It will be perceived at once that this connection of atonement and of justification with the doctrine under consideration, relieves both of them from the charge of being mechanical and arbitrary procedures. To say that

my sin is imputed to Christ while yet there is no tie of life uniting Christ to me, or to say that Christ's righteousness is imputed to me while yet there is no actual union between my soul and Christ, is as absurd and unscriptural as to say that Adam's sin is imputed to me while yet there is no natural connection between me and Adam. The Bible gives us a more intelligible theology; it not only declares that in Adam, that is, in union with Adam, all die, but it declares that all who are justified are justified in Christ Jesus, that is, in union with him. As Adam's sin is imputed to us, not because Adam is in us, but because we were in Adam, so Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, not because Christ is in us, but because we are in Christ, that is, joined by faith to one whose righteousness and life are infinitely greater than our power to appropriate or contain. In this sense we may indeed say that we are justified through a Christ outside of us, as we are sanctified through a Christ within us. In the words of Jonathan Edwards: "The justification of the believer is no other than his being admitted to communion in, or participation of, this head and surety of all believers." And so we see what true religion is. It is not a moral life; it is not a determination to be religious; it is not faith, if by faith we mean an external trust that somehow Christ will save us; it is nothing less than the life of the soul in God through Christ his Son. Regeneration is the act by which God brings the dead soul into union with Christ. And faith is the soul's laying hold of this Christ as the only source of life, and so, its only source of pardon and salvation.

But it is in the realm of practical life that we seek the ultimate fruit of this doctrine, and by this fruit also we must test it. It will stand the test. No truth of the Christian scheme has in it more of power to cheer or to purify. Such union as this involves the most sacred fellowship,—not only the Redeemer's fellowship with us, so that he is touched by our infirmities and afflicted in our affliction, but our fellowship with the Redeemer in his whole experience on earth, and in all that was gained by it for mankind. Only upon this principle of union with Christ, can we explain how the Christian instinctively applies to himself the prophecies and promises which were uttered originally and primarily with reference to Christ: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." The Christian seems to himself to be reproducing Christ's life in miniature and living it over again. He knows the power of Christ's resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death. And with this fellowship there is something better still — the transforming, assimilating power of Christ's life; first, for the soul, giving to it the self-sacrificing mind of the Redeemer here, and perfect likeness to his purity hereafter; and secondly, for the body, sanctifying it, in the present, to be the temple and dwelling of the Lord, and in the future, raising it up in the likeness of the body of Christ's glory. This is the work of Christ, now that he has ascended and taken to himself his power, namely, to give his life more and more fully to the church, until it shall grow up in all things into him, the head, and shall fitly express his glory to the world.

To those who know that they are united to Christ there must be assurance of salvation, for in virtue of their union with him, they know that his power, righteousness and love are engaged on their behalf. There must be courage to

do or suffer for the Redeemer's sake,— with Paul they may say: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." With this consciousness of our relation to our Lord, we shall be delivered not only from indolence and fear, but also from that half-fanatical and impatient earnestness, that false fervor and restless activity, which are sometimes mistaken for true zeal. There will be patience, when we once know Christ, and rest ourselves and our desires in those unwearied hands that move on silently but surely the wheels of victory and progress throughout the world. And what better argument and encouragement has believing prayer than this, that we are one with him whose kingdom and reign on earth are the very aim and goal of history, and the intercession of whose Spirit within our souls is the unfailing sign and accompaniment of a prevailing intercession before God's throne on high? And so the loftiest and most fruitful religious experience will be that which most perfectly realizes the oneness of our life with the life of the almighty and omnipresent Savior; which, without any pantheistic confounding of our personality with his, and without any self-deceiving notion of our sinless perfection, has yet the blessed assurance of the constant inward presence of Jesus and of his unchangeable love; which in all humility acknowledges itself so helpless and so dependent on him, that severed from him it can do absolutely nothing and must utterly perish, and which in that conviction gives up every effort of its own, opening the heart to receive Christ's life, and striving to make every act and word and desire the expression of that life within. To such an experience every Christian may aspire — for it he should pray. Let him thus lose himself, and he shall find his true self renewed and restored by the indwelling might of Christ's Spirit; he shall not only trust, but know, that he abides in Christ, and Christ in him. So shall his religion be one not of outward compulsion but of inward power. So shall life lose its harshness, its anxiety, its fear, since for him to live will be Christ, and to die will be gain.

A single word remains to be said with regard to the wider effects upon the world which may be expected to follow the full recognition of this doctrine by the church. All sin consists in the sundering of man's life from God, and most systems of falsehood in religion are attempts to save man without merging his life in God's life once more. Sacramental and external Christianity conceives of man as a mere tangent to the circle of the divine nature, touching it and touched by it only at a single point. The only religion that can save mankind is the religion that fills the whole heart and the whole life with God; and that aims to interpenetrate universal humanity with that same living Christ who has already made himself one with the believer. Humanity is a dead and shattered vine, plucked up from its roots in God, and fit only for the fires. But in Christ, God has planted a new vine, a vine full of his own divine life, a vine into which it is his purpose one by one to graft these dead and withered branches, so that they may once more have the life of God flowing through them and may bear the fruits of heaven. It is a supernatural, not a natural, process. But the things that are impossible with men are possible with God, and the process shall not cease until he has gathered together in one all things in Christ, and in him has perfectly redeemed and glorified the humanity for which and to which Christ has given his life.

XVIII.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.*

I desire to invite attention to what may seem a somewhat new, but what I trust will be esteemed an entirely legitimate, defense of a fundamental article of our denominational faith. I propose to approach the subject of baptism and its symbolism from a single side, and that, not the dogmatic or polemic, but rather the historical. There was such a baptism as the baptism of John; and Christ himself, the embodiment of Christianity and the pattern for the church, was baptized by John in the Jordan. I am persuaded that the proper understanding of that baptism of Jesus will throw a new and valuable light upon the meaning of baptism in the case of Christ's followers. Let us first, then, try to put ourselves back in those far-off times, and figure to ourselves how the baptism of Jesus came about in the natural order of his life, and expressed the meaning of that life. We shall find doctrinal and practical lessons all along, but at the end we may stand aside, as it were, and look at the great truths which, like separate colored rays, converge and meet and blend in that scene upon the banks of the Jordan.

Let us put ourselves back, I say, — back into the times preceding the ministry of John the Baptist, when the gospel of the kingdom was just preparing to break in upon the world. The thirty peaceful years of Jesus' early life were past. The vast work, which at the first had appeared dim and distant as a form in the mist, had drawn nearer and nearer, and had now assumed the hard outline and definite proportions of tremendous and inevitable fact. What prophets had foretold, what his own being demanded, that must be. Connected in every fibre of his being with the common nature of mankind, he saw that he must suffer, the just for the unjust. It could not be that human nature should fail of enduring the settled and necessary penalty of its sin. And he not only had a human nature, but in him human nature was organically united as it never had been before except in Adam. If the members suffered, should not also the head?

When he was but twelve years of age, the consciousness of this divine commission had dawned upon him. Sitting as an humble questioner before the doctors of the law, the conviction had become overmastering: "I am he — the teacher and prophet promised long ago, the fulfillment of this spiritual law which the doctors cannot comprehend, the suffering Messiah against whom their pride rebels; I am he — the Sent of God, the Son of God." And the eighteen years that followed had made this conviction part and parcel of his very being. Growing with his growth and strengthening with

* Originally prepared as a sermon upon the text, Mat. 3: 15 — "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," and preached before the Cincinnati Baptist Union; printed in the Examiner, February 12, and February 19, 1880.

his strength, it had taken up into itself all the energies of his soul, conscious or unconscious, until his life and his work were identical, and he could say: "Lo! I come to do thy will, O God!"

Can we imagine that such years as these were free from agitations and anxieties? Can we imagine that the looming-up before him of so grand and yet so terrible a destiny was accompanied by no struggle and no temptation? We know little, it is true, of those early years. But we know that Jesus was very man as well as very God, and tried in all points like ourselves. Peaceful years these doubtless were when compared with the conflict and agony to come, but only peaceful as years of preparation for that conflict and agony — peaceful as the quiet stationing of batteries and filing by of troops on the morning of some day whose sun is to set in blood — peaceful as Niagara above the cataract, whose smooth waters, possessed with an irresistible gravitation, break at length into rapids as they go, as if in conscious preparation for that final moment when, agitated to their utmost depths and with one consent of majestic self-abandonment, they hurl themselves into the chasm below.

But now at last even such peaceful days as these were over. A voice sounded out like a trumpet-call from the wild region near the Jordan, summoning the nation to repentance, and proclaiming the speedy approach of the Messiah. It was the voice of John the Baptist, the last and greatest of the prophets, the new Elijah, in his shaggy herdsman's dress of camel's hair, the appointed herald and forerunner of the Kingdom. If the whole land had been a whispering-gallery, the news could not have gone on swifter wings. The all-penetrating power of Luther's theses in Germany was not more wonderful. It roused whatever there was left of patriotic and religious feeling in Judæa and Jerusalem. Sunk as they were in formalism and worldliness, thousands upon thousands flocked from city and country, and were baptized in Jordan, confessing their sins. The voice pierced even to the distant valleys of Galilee, and the villages around Nazareth poured forth their recruits to John's army of penitents. For nine whole months the work went on; spring, summer, autumn went by, and winter came at last; the wave of excitement had swept over all Palestine; the whole land was in a fever of expectation; every eye was looking for the appearance of that grander Personage, the latchet of whose shoes John was not worthy to unloose.

And where was Jesus? In the carpenter's shop of Nazareth, calm, silent, unrecognized, yet nourishing a world of mighty thoughts, feeling within him a thousand forward-moving impulses, yet waiting in patience and self-restraint the time appointed by the Father. Strong as were the inward impulses that urged him forward to his work, he could not move from his place till John's preparatory ministry had accomplished its purpose. And so, while Nazareth was full of rumors, and scores departed every week for the Jordan, the household of Mary remained undisturbed. Only Jesus recognized in John's work the sign that his time was at hand.

There came a day, however, when, just as calmly as he had performed his humble duties of son, brother and citizen, he left these duties forever, left the home of his childhood and the carpenter's bench at which he had worked so many years, to enter upon the labor and struggle and suffering that belonged to him as the world's Redeemer. It would be matter of intense

interest if we could follow each separate step of his journey as he made his way, humble and unnoticed among the crowd of pilgrims, "to Jordan, unto John." But we are left to conjecture here. Whether he held himself aloof from the multitude and proceeded in silence, or mingled in the talk and wayside worship of his townsmen, we do not know. But we do know that it was with solemn mind he went. The crisis of his life was just before him. He was to break all the ties that bound him to the past. He was to give himself to the greatest work man ever had to do. He was to receive his final anointing as Prophet, Priest and King. Not in the might and glory of his divinity, but as a lowly and agitated son of man, seeking divine grace to help in time of need, did Jesus come to John to be baptized of him.

And here is the first great meaning of his baptism. It was essentially a self-consecration. He came to commit himself to the vast work that was before him. He felt just as you or I feel on the eve of some great enterprise that is to task to the utmost our fortitude and patience and virtue. He felt the weakness of mere human nature, and the need of strengthening it by solemnly and publicly pledging himself before God and angels and men. So — if we may compare great things with small — so Gustavus Adolphus felt, when, on leaving Sweden to fight for Protestantism in Germany, he assembled the States-General, committed his infant daughter and successor to their care, and before all the magnates of his kingdom vowed to deliver Germany or die. So the disciple of Christ only follows in the footsteps of his Savior, when he strengthens his resolves and commits himself to the service of his Master by publicly and solemnly expressing his allegiance and devotion in his baptism. For there was a human side to every action of Jesus' life. Here, when he came to meet his destiny, and give himself to that mighty work whose distant prospect had been at once so fearful and so grand, we cannot doubt that there was all the natural shrinking and anxiety, all the overwhelming burden of responsibility, that could rest upon the heart of any son of man. And we lose sight of a most important feature of Jesus' baptism if we fail to see that it was a solemn inauguration of his public ministry, in which he strengthened his soul by publicly consecrating himself to the unmeasured toils and trials which that ministry in its very nature involved.

But this was only the first element in its meaning. It was also a symbol of his death. The consecration was a definite consecration — a consecration to death, — and this was the second thing expressed in his baptism. What baptism meant to Jesus, he himself intimated nearly three years after this, and about four months before his death. He had been speaking of the power of the gospel when his work should be completed and the full glory of it should dawn upon the world. To his imagination, the mighty effects of it could only be compared to those of fire and flame, seizing upon human nature and purifying it in every part, but destroying all that refused to be refined. "I am come to send fire on earth, and what will I? Oh, that it were already kindled!" But even while he looked forward with longing to that day, the thought came to him that he himself must be baptized in blood before he could baptize with fire; all the dreadful pains of the cross rose before his eyes; the gulf of death that was to swallow him up yawned at his feet; his soul was the scene of an agony and a conflict such as fell on him in

the temple and in the garden; he cried in distress: "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"

Still another incident in Jesus' life needs to be compared with this, that we may see what idea was in Jesus' mind when he spoke of a future baptism. You recollect the request of the ambitious sons of Zebedee, who desired to sit, the one on his right hand and the other on his left, in his kingdom. It occurred only three or four weeks before Jesus' crucifixion. Examine Jesus' answer to this request of James and John, and you cannot fail to see that the "baptism" he referred to was his death. He told them that the pathway to glory with him must be through a death-suffering like his own. "Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Here the cup was the cup of suffering which was pressed to his lips in Gethsemane, when he cried to the Father: "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me;" and the baptism was the baptism of death on Calvary and of the grave that was to follow.

But how could death present itself to his mind as a baptism? I answer, the being immersed and overwhelmed in waters is a frequent metaphor in all languages to express the rush of successive troubles; and to our Savior's mind the dreadful sufferings and bitter death before him seemed like deep and dark waters, into which he must go down until their heavy floods swept over him and his life was drowned beneath the billows. In the words of the Psalmist, Christ could say: "I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me. All thy waves and thy billows have gone over me. Then the waters overwhelmed me; the stream went over my soul; then the proud waters went over my soul." The suffering and death and burial which were before him presented themselves to his mind as a baptism, because the very idea of baptism was that of a complete submersion under the floods of waters. So apprehended, there is an untold sublimity in the figure that flashed upon his mind. Death was not poured upon him,— it was no sprinkling of suffering which the Savior endured, but a sinking into the mighty waters with which death and the grave overwhelmed him.

See the significance of Jesus' baptism in Jordan. It was no merely formal and ritual act — there are none such in Christ's religion — least of all were there any in the life of Christ himself. All his words and deeds were instinct with life and meaning. There was nothing arbitrary in this transaction which signalized the beginning of his ministry and the public consecration of himself to the work he had to do. No, the essential feature of that work was his death,— that was ever in his eyes from the beginning to the end. All his teaching and his suffering was but the prelude to that. The cross, the grave, the resurrection — these were the crown and consummation of all, coloring all the events that came before with their own matchless and crimson light. And so the baptism of Jesus was not only his public consecration of himself to the work before him, but it expressed the essential nature of that work,— in other words the baptism of water at the beginning of his ministry consciously and designedly prefigured the baptism of death with which that ministry was to close.

Stop here one moment to mark the incidental proof which this fact gives us of Jesus' understanding, from the very commencement of his public life, the meaning and the end of that life. The final agony and death-struggle,

when they came, were not, as some skeptics have maintained, unforeseen and surprising contingencies to him, but were the precise events for which he had long been preparing, and to the accomplishment of which he had voluntarily and knowingly devoted himself in his baptism. With full knowledge of what was to come, Jesus "gave himself for us." In the words of one of the purest of religious poets :—

> "As at the first, thine all pervading look
> Saw from thy Father's bosom to the abyss,
> Measuring in calm presage
> The infinite descent,
>
> "So to the end, though now of mortal pangs
> Made heir, and emptied of thy glory awhile,
> With unaverted eye
> Thou meetest all the storm."

I have spoken of Jesus' baptism, first, as an act of self-consecration, and secondly, as a symbol of the death to which he devoted himself. Let me speak of it now, in the third place, as a proof of Jesus' connection with humanity, with its sin and its desert of death. Jesus' connection with human sin, and his consecration to death for the sins of the world — how clearly that stands out in the baptism! Jesus came to Jordan to submit to John's baptism of repentance. And what was John's baptism of repentance? Nothing less than the total immersion of the body in water, the plunging of each penitent beneath the swift-flowing current, in token that he who submitted to it "buried himself into death as one laden with guilt and defilement, and rose as a new man to a new and holy life." But Jesus personally, and in every act and thought of his life, was sinless; upon what possible ground could he undergo this rite which properly belonged to sinners? And here we come to the greatest mystery of God's grace, the person of Jesus Christ, and his assumption of the common nature of us all. If Jesus had no connection with a sinful and lost humanity, or if that connection with a sinful and lost humanity had been merely a factitious and forensic one, then it would have been the grossest breach of justice, the sheerest insult to purity, the most extravagant of absurdities, that the Lord Jesus should have submitted to an ordinance which was in itself, in some sense, a confession of sin and a declaration that this sin deserved nothing less than death.

I am persuaded that we can never explain the baptism of our Lord, unless we remember that Jesus was "made sin for us," taking our nature upon him, with all its exposures and liabilities, yet without its hereditary corruption, that he might redeem it and reunite it to God. But this one mighty fact, the taking upon him of our nature, this does explain it. As one with humanity, he had in his unconscious childhood submitted to the rites of circumcision, purification and redemption, appointed by the law, and all of these were rites appointed for sinners. As one with humanity, he was yet to "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." "Made in the likeness of sinful flesh," he foresaw that the crowning act of his earthly work must be to "descend into death, laden with the guilt of humanity, and as a glorified conqueror rise from the grave, the head of a new and holy race." This was the truth to which he testified in his baptism, that since "without shedding of blood there was no remission," and he had taken to himself the nature that had sinned, he had taken to himself death also, and "it must needs be that

Christ should suffer." So Christ's baptism was an emblem of the burial of a sinful humanity into death, that it might rise in him to life and glory.

It is in the light of Jesus' participation in our nature and consequent connection with human sin, that Jesus' words: "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," stand out in their full splendor of meaning. John, you remember, had refused to baptize Jesus. Either from previous acquaintance or from prophetic insight, John had recognized him, at his coming, as the holiest being he had ever known. It seemed to him most unfit that the greater should be baptized by the less. Baptism belonged only to such as were in some way under the power and penalty of sin,—how could one who was "holy, harmless and undefiled" testify that he was under sin's curse and misery? Ah, how dim and imperfect even then were the Baptist's conception of Jesus' work! Not yet had he reached that loftiest summit of Old Testament revelation from which his eyes beheld the cross and he could cry: "Behold the Lamb of God, who taketh, and so taketh away, the sins of the world."

It was to remove this very reluctance of the Baptist, that Jesus uttered those memorable words: "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." And what did he mean but this, that only through the final baptism of suffering and death which this baptism of water foreshadowed, could he "make an end of sins," and "bring in everlasting righteousness" to a condemned and ruined world. It is that final baptism which is chiefly, if not altogether, in the Savior's eye when he says: "*Thus* it becometh us." The righteousness of which humanity had come short he was to fulfill—that which humanity had lost he was to restore. But he could not be "the Lord our Righteousness," the head of a new race and the source of righteousness for all mankind, except by first suffering the death due to the nature he had assumed, thereby delivering it from its exposures and perfecting it forever. Therefore he came as the lowest and humblest of all that crowd of pilgrims, came as one laden with the guilt of humanity, to submit himself in symbol to the death that was its due. How fully John understood the words of Jesus, we do not know,—we only know that "then he suffered him." Those words about "fulfilling all righteousness," uttered by one who was himself so righteous, overbore his doubts, and "the Redeemer descended with his forerunner into the rapid waters of the sacred river," and there was buried in the likeness of his coming death, and raised again in the likeness of his coming resurrection.

The coming resurrection, did I say? Yes, there was a foreshadowing of the coming glory, as well as of the coming sorrow. The events that followed had each their separate meaning. Think with what profound emotion Jesus must have come up from that Jordan-flood. The die was cast; the step was taken; henceforth there was no possible retreat; it was as if the marks of death had already been sealed upon hands and feet and brow. The past was past forever. No longer the isolated meditative days of Nazareth, but a public life of continual struggle and temptation, with the staring eyes of the whole world upon him. And on a little way further were the shame, the agony, the cross, the grave. How shall he enter these shadows, how shall he endure these pains, how shall he perform this work? I point you to the scene itself for your answer. See the Savior going up that river-bank

— see those uplifted hands — see the great soul, unconscious of the crowds that gaze upon him, and only rapt in one intense desire for the comfort and strength of God, beseeching even there the help and blessing of his Father — aye, even while his eyes are lifted to the hills whence alone his help can come, see the quick answer from above : "the heavens opened and the Spirit of God," the Spirit of grace and power, of wisdom and comfort and peace, "descending like a dove and lighting upon him"— never more to leave him till his work is done, and he receives his crown and his reward.

Nor is this all. The Spirit and the Son are there, but this is not enough. About this transcendent scene the lustre, not of one or two, but of all three persons of the blessed Trinity must shine. The Father also speaks from the heavens above : "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." As the descent of the Spirit is the anointing and qualifying of Messiah for his work of Prophet, Priest and King, so the voice from heaven declares the acceptance of his consecration to death, and attests his commission from God as divine Redeemer of mankind. Jesus not only went forward knowingly to his final baptism of death, but he went forward in conscious accord with God's eternal plan and as executor of the counsels of heaven.

What blessing and relief came to that overburdened heart with this double answer to his prayer, we can but poorly conceive. What assurance must have flooded his soul — assurance that in all the dreary road before him, his humanity should never be left to its own native weakness, but should find in God a very present and almighty help in time of trouble! More than this, the descent of the Spirit was a pledge of victory — a pledge of victory grander than ever was vouchsafed to ancient warrior on the eve of battle. It was God's own seal set at the beginning upon Jesus' work — the seal of Him whose counsels never fail, and who is omnipotent to execute his purpose of salvation. These divine attestations, what do they signify but this, that the descent into the grave should not be forever; he should rise again triumphant — the heavens should be once more opened to receive him; attended by thousands of angels and with ten thousand times ten thousand coming forth to meet him, he should be welcomed to a seat at the right hand of the Majesty on high, while to all the universe God should say : "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Thus far I have endeavored to set forth, in its historical connections and aspects, that most impressive and sublime act with which Jesus inaugurated his public ministry. I have described his baptism as a self-consecration, as a consecration to death, as a consecration to death for human sin. Let me conclude my presentation of the subject by summing up the symbolic teaching of this momentous transaction, and so exhibiting what seems to me its great doctrinal and practical value.

I see in the baptism of Jesus, first of all, a vivid representation of the ill-desert and fearful penalty of sin. I recollect a picture of the Deluge by Gustave Doré, in which the rising waters have submerged all but the highest hill-tops. On these, under an angry sky, lit up only by vivid lightnings, are gathered the only survivors from among the wicked. Pale and frantic, they fight with wild beasts and with one another for the topmost place of safety. They hold appealing hands up to the heavens, but the heavens are black and mutter thunder. They look down to the surging waves beneath, but

these gain upon them every moment, until conquered and despairing they fling themselves upon the bare rocks and there await their dreadful inevitable doom. A few moments more, and the ravenous waters will engulf them and sweep away their name and memory forever. That picture of Gustave Doré is a picture of the destiny of the human race, a picture of your destiny and mine, left to our sin and to the judgments which follow in its train.

But there is another picture of the desert and end of a sinful humanity, more striking still. The baptism of Jesus, how solemnly that speaks of the floods of divine anger that must envelope a guilty race! What! must one who is purity itself, nay, divinity itself, go down into death, merely because he has united himself to my nature? Then my nature must be under the ban and curse of death. Must Jesus be overwhelmed with suffering, simply because of that which he has in common with all men that have ever breathed? Then all men must by virtue of that same nature be under the wrath of God. Aye, ten thousand times more than he, for all men have not only inherited this nature, but have wilfully perverted their way and set themselves against the law of God. I see, then, in this sinking of Jesus beneath the waters of the Jordan, the declaration that all mankind are doomed to hopeless burial. If Jesus, personally sinless as he was, found that the taking of human nature involved death, how much more shall we, who are personally guilty and defiled, find that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."

Secondly, Jesus' baptism presents to us a picture of human nature delivered from the penalty and power of sin. If it had been God's purpose to set forth simply the death that was due to sin, we should have seen Jesus drowned beneath the waves forever. But this was not all. God purposed also to represent humanity as coming up new-born from the grave where its sin and guilt were buried. I need not only to see an emblem of the death that is due to sin — I need also to see that this death has been endured for me. I need not only to see that human nature has borne the penalty — I need also to see that human nature has exhausted the penalty, and has risen from it triumphant and free. And this I see depicted in the baptism of Jesus. His sinking beneath the Jordan-current typified a death actually endured by human nature in him. His rising from the stream once more, and his reception of those attestations from on high, typified the resurrection of that same human nature, its deliverance from the last remains of sin, and its new condition as redeemed from the bondage of the law, filled with the Spirit of God, admitted to the honors of sonship in God's family, and glorified in and with Jesus Christ its Lord.

Years ago I saw in a European gallery that masterpiece of Thorwaldsen, the Danish sculptor, Christ and his Apostles. The eye wandered from one to the other of those twelve marble forms, and in each there was some characteristic expression that riveted the attention. There was the impulsive boldness in the very lines of Peter's face. The tender melancholy of Thomas, the artless openness of Philip, the seraphic ardor of John, were all imaged in the solid stone. But then each face reminded you also of its possessor's peculiar weakness. Peter's rashness and instability, Thomas's doubting, were there. The more you gazed upon the statues of the apostles, the more you felt a lack — here were only fragmentary virtues, — and with these virtues

were defects and sins. But, standing in a half circle as they were, each form by its attitude or look or gesture seemed to point you to the centre, as if all their hopes and affections gathered there. And there was the figure of the Christ, greater than they in height, and far transcending them in dignity. In that one majestic form all the good in them seemed united, and on that calm commanding brow there was ineffable holiness and peace. How often, as I have vainly sought through the ages for an example of perfectly emancipated humanity, have I thought of Thorwaldsen's Christ! How often, as I have struggled with the forces of evil in my own nature, have I seen in that remembered master-piece of art the mute assurance that there is one who has conquered sin and death for me, and who has lifted human nature up into union with God and likeness to God! Towering above all the forms of men I see the risen Jesus, and in him my nature ransomed, purified, perfected, glorified. And this sublime fact, this sublime hope of humanity, I see symbolically represented in Jesus' baptism. His rising from that watery grave teaches me that there is now a human nature "without sin," and over which "death hath no more dominion" forever.

But some are doubtless saying: "How difficult it is to believe that this external work of Christ has anything to do with us! Christ's risen and glorified humanity — that is not ours — that cannot be made ours." Yes, I answer; yes, it may be made ours — it is ours. And this is the third lesson taught us by Jesus' baptism. That baptism affords me a picture also of the method of my personal salvation, by union with the crucified and risen Jesus. I also must die to sin by having Jesus' death reproduced in me. I must rise to a new life by having Jesus' resurrection reproduced in me. I must enter into communion with the death and resurrection of my Lord — yes, I must participate in both. The putting away of the sin and guilt of humanity, which was the essential feature of Jesus' work, must take place in me; and this I must do by having my life incorporated with his life, so that his mighty life within lifts me out of the dominion of sin and death into his own region of life and peace. It was humanity that bore the curse in his death, and all the true life of humanity rose from the dead in his resurrection. Now if I am united to him and participate in this new humanity of which he is the head, I may take for mine not only all that Jesus has done, but all that Jesus is. In other words, my union with Christ must result in a change within me; and I can never be saved unless I so appropriate the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus that there results within me a corresponding death to sin and resurrection to holiness.

Let me illustrate what I mean by a curious tract which I once saw. It was entitled: "The Seven Togethers." It was nothing more nor less than a combination and exposition of seven remarkable passages with regard to the union of the believer with Christ. These "seven togethers" are seven links of a golden chain that binds us indissolubly to the Redeemer. They are: 1st, Crucified together with Christ; 2dly, Quickened together with Christ; 3dly, raised together with Christ: 4thly, Seated together with Christ in heavenly places; 5thly, sufferers together with Christ; 6thly, Heirs together with Christ; 7thly, Glorified together with Christ. In these Scripture phrases is the whole essence of the Gospel; for it is nothing else than union with a personal living Christ that saves us, a union with him by faith,

such that what he has done in the past becomes ours, and we know in the present "the fellowship of his sufferings, and the power of his resurrection, being made conformable unto his death." And this great truth of salvation for all, upon the simple condition of uniting themselves to Jesus by faith, I see set forth in the baptism of Jesus. I see not Jesus only, going down into the grave and coming up a conqueror, but myself also — yes, and every believer, too — giving to death the body of the sins of the flesh, and rising in him to life and glory.

Finally, we should see in this transaction a picture of the duty of those who have believed in Jesus. To all such there comes the obligation to profess his name before men. And in what way should they profess his name? If what has been said is true, then the entrance of the soul into the communion of Christ's death and resurrection should be signified to the world by a baptism like his. Nothing but the total immersion of the body in water will answer the design of the ordinance, on the one hand, because nothing else can symbolize the greatness and radical nature of the change effected in regeneration — a change from spiritual death to spiritual life. Nothing else will answer the design of the ordinance, on the other hand, because nothing else can set forth the fact that this change from spiritual death to spiritual life is connected with and wholly dependent upon the death and resurrection of Jesus. We owe all to Christ's work for us. Is it too much that we should signify this obligation in the symbol by which we declare our change to the world?

Just here is the reason why we cannot alter the form of the ordinance. We cannot alter it, because we cannot take out of it its reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus, and to our spiritual death and resurrection with him. As Jesus' baptism pointed forward to his death and resurrection, so the baptism of the believer points backward to the same. And wheresoever baptism is administered, whether by John the Baptist, or by the apostles, or by the later ministers of Christ's church, it points evermore to that great central fact of the Christian scheme, that one death by which we live, the death of the God-man for the sins of the world. Thus "it becomes us" also "to fulfill all righteousness," first, by dying to sin in spirit and rising to a new life of penitence and faith, and then by symbolizing our dependence upon Christ's death and our consecration to a life like his, by following in his footsteps who was buried by John beneath the waters of the Jordan. The course which the Savior took is the course for those who profess to follow him, for "the servant is not above his master, neither the disciple above his Lord."

In this common reference to the death of Christ we have the link which binds the two ordinances of Christ's church together. They both and equally are symbols of the death of Christ. In baptism we show forth the death of Christ as the procuring cause of our new birth into the kingdom of God. In the Lord's Supper we show forth the death of Christ as the sustaining power of our spiritual life after that life has once begun. In the ordinance of baptism we honor the regenerating power of the death of Christ, as in the Lord's Supper we honor its sanctifying power. Thus both the ordinances are parts of one whole — setting before us Christ's death for men, in its two great purposes and results. The two ordinances combined constitute a

double monument to the historical fact of Jesus' death for the sins of the world. As the children of an Israelitish family, gathered at the Passover festival, asked of the father, who sat at the head of the board, the question: "What mean ye by this service?" and the father answered: "It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover," thus handing down to the coming generation the memory of the great deliverance which God had wrought in old time for their nation, so now the world asks and the church explains what she means by this double service of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper. And her answer, according to the Scriptures, must evermore be this, that in these two ordinances, she preserves a symbol of that great historical fact of her own past deliverance through the shedding of Christ's blood. To change the form of the ordinance of baptism is to break down a mighty monument to the great central fact of the Gospel — to break down a monument which God himself has set up, that it may witness to all the world that Christ has died to save it. A form that signifies purification simply, is not sufficient. Baptism symbolizes purification, indeed, but purification in a peculiar and divine way, namely, through the death of Christ and the entrance of the soul into communion with that death. The radical defect of sprinkling or pouring as a mode of administering the ordinance is this, that it does not point to Christ's death as the procuring cause of our purification. In baptism we are bound to show forth the Lord's death as the original source of holiness and life in our souls, just as in the Lord's Supper we are bound to show forth the Lord's death as the source of all nourishment and strength after this life of holiness has once begun. To substitute for the broken bread and poured-out wine of the Communion some form of administration which leaves out all reference to the death of Christ, would be to destroy the Lord's Supper, and to celebrate an ordinance of human invention. And in like manner, to substitute for Baptism any form of administration which excludes all symbolic reference to the death of Christ, is to destroy that ordinance. Without immersion, you have baptism no longer, but an ordinance of human invention. It is for this reason that we stand for baptism in its integrity — not because of the form itself, but for the sake of the unspeakably important truth which the form embodies; not for the sake of indulging private preference or fancy, but that the church may witness continuously and consistently, in her ordinances as well as in her preaching, to that truth which constitutes the soul of her soul and the life of her life.

I have somewhere read that the mortar which cements the stones of the great mosque of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, still retains the fragrance of the musk that was mingled with it when Justinian built the edifice in the sixth century as a temple of the Lord. The infidel Turk has captured and spoiled it; the worship of Christ has given place to the religion of Mohammed; the cross has been humbled, and the crescent seems to utter over it from year to year a silent and symbolic boast of growth and conquest; yet still a keen sense can discern exhaling from the very substance of the structure the imperishable aroma of that early devotion that counted the costliest perfumes none too precious to enrich and sanctify the house of God. The ordinance of baptism is like the church Justinian built,— the fragrant spices of Jesus' burial are wrought into its very structure, and yield their perfume from age to age. Through all the vicissitudes of Christian history, its due adminis-

tration is a visible witness and memorial of the death of Christ, a proof even to the senses of that matchless love that endured the agony and bloody sweat, the cross and passion, and that went down into the darkness of the sepulchre that it might "open the kingdom of heaven to all believers." Wonderful symbol! combining in one picture all the essential truths of the Christian scheme, expressing not only the fact of death to sin, and resurrection to righteousness, but also the method of that fact — through the union of our souls with a dying and a risen Savior! Let this ordinance in which the believer follows his Master's example of consecration be forever sacred to us. Let us preserve it in its integrity, as the Lord has delivered it to us. Witnessing it, may we ever find it an encouragement to hope and an incitement to duty. And as the life and death of Jesus answered to the consecration which he made on the banks of Jordan, so let our lives witness that at our baptism we truly died to sin and rose to newness of life!

XIX.

CHRISTIAN TRUTH AND ITS KEEPERS.*

I have seen it stated that the origin of the American Baptist Publication Society was due to a circumstance as simple as that falling of the apple from the tree which revealed to Newton the law of gravitation. The falling of a little tract from the hat of the Rev. Samuel Cornelius suggested to Noah Davis the idea of a General Tract Society, that should fill the land with a trenchant and succinct denominational literature. It might almost seem that Mr. Darwin's doctrine of "pangenesis" had found an illustration here, and that this cellule of an idea contained the germs of the whole subsequent structure of this society. I have no notion, however, that either its beginnings or its after-work can be explained by any mere law of natural development. There are such things as new creations, not only in geologic history but in the history of the church, and I believe that the starting of this society into life was one of those new creations. I attribute its origin, not to Noah Davis, who saw the tract fall, nor to Samuel Cornelius, from whose hat it fell, but rather to that all-working Providence which in every century and through agencies utterly insufficient of themselves, summons new moral forces into being to further the progress of his truth. And if this be their origin, then we may dismiss our fears lest these organizations take from the church her honor or her responsibility. They are the appointed servants and helpers of the church,— when they work, it is the church that works through them,— all their glory is the glory of the church. My only fear is that we forget that these societies hold their commission from God, that they have been raised up as bulwarks and defenses of his truth, and that the demands they make upon us are the demands of Christ himself. I ask your attention to certain considerations which vindicate the claims of this society for help in its great work of furnishing a cheap denominational literature. I maintain that the work of propagating our peculiar views of truth is correct in principle; that we who hold these views are specially ordained to this work; and that the methods of which we make use are demanded in these times by a sound Christian expediency.

The principle upon which our whole work is based is nothing more nor less than this: Christ's truth is an organic whole, all whose parts have vital connections with each other, so that to stand for any one part of the great system is logically to stand for every other part,— to harm any part is to do injury to the whole. We all know something of the organic unity of the human body. Suppose a man comes to me and asks me to let him cut off one joint of my finger, on the ground that it is a very small part of my body

*An address delivered before the American Baptist Publication Society, at its annual meeting in New York City, May, 1868.

and that its loss will not be felt,— you would think him crazy, and you would think me crazier still to grant his request. To tear one joint from my finger is to maim the whole body, and send horrible pains through every part. God's truth is an organic whole like a human body. Injure it in any one part, however insignificant, and you injure the whole, you sap the life-blood, the blow is felt at the very heart. Just as the law of God is the expression of the will of the One Lawgiver, and therefore he who offends in one part is guilty of all, so Christian doctrine is a reflection of the being and nature of the God of truth, and he who denies or hides any part of it, however small, is, just so far, bringing the Sun of Righteousness into disastrous eclipse, and destroying the symmetry and power of God's revelation of himself to men.

Now we believe that our distinctive denominational tenets are part and parcel of this truth of God, and as such are built into the very frame-work of Christianity so that they cannot be torn away without injury to the whole structure. Those grand principles for which our fathers contended even unto death — the sole authority of the word of God, the freedom of conscience from all civil domination, the admission of none but baptized believers to the membership and ordinances of the church, the right of every member of the church to a voice in its government and discipline — these principles are not only logically inseparable from one another, but are organically connected with the whole body of revealed truth. Even that tenet of our faith, that nothing is baptism but the immersion of the believer in water in the name of the Trinity, is linked in organic unity to every other part of the Christian scheme. And as this may illustrate what I mean by the organic unity of revealed truth, let me ask you to give a moment's reflection to the relations of baptism, first, to Christian doctrine as a whole and then to the other ordinance of Christ's house, the Holy Supper.

Baptism is not a meaningless ceremonial — it symbolizes the great central truth of the gospel — in its very form it represents a death, burial and resurrection. "Whose death," do you ask? The death of Christ, I answer, and the entrance of the believer into communion with that death. We see the death of Christ set forth as clearly and powerfully in Baptism as in the Holy Supper. Baptism signifies purification indeed, but purification only in a peculiar and divine way, namely, through the death of Christ and our personal communion with that death by faith. It is said that in the last century, every rope, great or small, that was used throughout the British navy, had a scarlet thread running through it from end to end; lost, stolen, sunk beneath the waves though it might be, the smallest vestige of the cordage showed by this simple thread that it bore the King's mark and was the possession of the crown. So there is a scarlet thread running through the whole circle of Christian doctrine and practice certifying that all its different parts are one. It is the scarlet thread of the blood of Jesus. That scarlet thread runs through the ordinance of Baptism — that reference to Jesus' death reveals to us its divine significance — that emblematic declaration that even the beginnings of spiritual life must have their source in the fountain of Jesus' blood, vindicates its place and importance as an indispensable part of Christian doctrine and practice, and gives it all its glory as the initiatory ordinance of the Christian church. But this is not all. Baptism not only

sets forth with all the vividness of sign-language the great central truth of the gospel, but other related truths find expression there as well. That sacred ordinance is nothing less indeed than a pictorial representation of the whole substance of Christianity, an incarnation in symbol of all the essential truths upon which our salvation hangs, a mirroring forth in visible form of the great invisible realities of atonement through Jesus' death, regeneration by the power of the Spirit, union with Christ by a living faith, resurrection with Christ to a new life here and eternal glory hereafter. Thus Baptism is bound up in the organic unity of the Christian scheme. To defend Christ's ordinance from abuse and perversion is not to preach a partial and sectarian gospel, but to stand for the whole system of doctrine which that ordinance sets forth and illustrates. To substitute anything for Baptism which excludes all reference to the death of Christ is to falsify the whole body of Christian truth and break down one of the grand safeguards of Christian doctrine.

Observe, too, how this reference of Baptism unites it by a living tie to that other ordinance of Christ's house, the Holy Supper. We know the tenacity with which all branches of the Christian church hold to the symbolism of the Communion. There is a so-called Protestant church in this city where the eucharist is weekly celebrated by the light of blazing candles, while incense and procession and genuflexion lend their meretricious attractions to an ordinance which was meant to commemorate the Savior's death, but which has come to be little else than a piece of Romish idolatry. Yet if you were to suggest to these ritualistic Christians that they might substitute for the broken bread and poured-out wine of the communion, some other form of administering the ordinance which would leave out all reference to the death of Christ, even they, with all their forgetfulness of its real spirit, would start back in horror of the sacrilege, because in that sacred ordinance they see compacted all the creed, and hold themselves specially commissioned to maintain it inviolate forever, as a visible witness for the central truths of the gospel. To celebrate the Holy Supper in any form which obscures to popular apprehension the mighty sacrifice it was meant to commemorate, is to celebrate not the Holy Supper but some ordinance of human invention. But who has authorized us to empty one ordinance of its meaning, any more than the other? Even the High Churchman can appreciate the shock which the Christian faith would sustain, if all reference to the death of Christ were taken out of the Communion, for it would be equivalent to declaring that Christian life could be preserved and nourished apart from that one death by which alone we live. But is it any the less a wrong to the whole body of truth to assert in symbol that Christian life and purity can begin in the soul without having its source in the death of Christ? Yet this is done whenever anything is substituted for baptism which cannot set forth a burial with Christ. The one ordinance is as sacred as the other — both are bound together by their common reference to the death of Jesus. Like those twins of whom old Hippocrates wrote, one life and breath seems to animate both, one blood pulsates through their veins, they smile and weep together, their minds are united in electric sympathies, when one suffers the other suffers with it, when one dies, the same hour witnesses the death of the other also. Let baptism degenerate into a half-mystical, half-magical rite, void of all allusion to the sacrifice on Calvary, and administered to

those whose infantile years preclude all conscious communion by faith with the Savior's death, and you have not far to go to see the perversion of the Lord's Supper into a sensuous accessory of ritualistic worship by which in some cabalistic way the communicant is manipulated into the kingdom of heaven, and made partaker of the blessings promised only to the believer. Regard for the integrity of the Lord's Supper, as well as for the great sum of truth of which these two ordinances are constituent parts and appointed emblems, urges us to keep the ordinance of Baptism as it was first delivered to the church, a living symbol of the death of Christ, and of our entrance into communion with that death by faith.

But I am asked, what peculiar responsibility have we as Baptists, more than others, in upholding and propagating our distinctive views? Let me reply briefly to this question by laying down a second principle, of as great practical importance as that first one with regard to the organic unity of Christian truth. It is this : — Christ has committed special truths of his great system to special keepers. It has been so through the whole history of man. Both civilization and religion have gone out from centres. Revelation was first given to a historic nation, that from them it might be disseminated through the world. And in this is the wisdom of God. There were two possible plans,— one to give the knowledge of himself in disconnected parts, to individuals isolated and scattered here and there over the globe, — the other to make the revelation in a fixed place, to one people and with historic connection and unity. Any one can see that the last is better than the first, just as the introduction of a new variety of wheat could be better effected by planting it at first in a single field, than by scattering single grains of it here and there over the surface of the world, and thus running the risk of total choking-out and extinction. Just as God has made the great fundamental truths of religion to go out from Judæa and her now stricken and desolate race, so he has made some single branches of his church the special interpreters and defenders of single portions of his truth, and has laid on them the charge of keeping the light of those special truths burning before the nations.

I am not one of those who are in anguish of spirit over the multiplicity of sects. Mere unity of external organization may be a deceit and a snare, as the palmy days of the Roman hierarchy may witness. The only unity worth striving for is that unity in the truth, which the Spirit of God, dwelling in all true believers, is working out in the course of the church's history. But that unity in the faith to which we all shall ultimately come is to be promoted only by the fidelity of each body of Christians to the truth as they apprehend it. God's word is a field in which many a treasure still lies hid. When any man or set of men gets hold of a truth that has been hitherto neglected, and finds it full of power and life, the natural tendency, yes, the providential design, is that the new spirit should take to itself a new form, and through a new outward organization, impress upon the world its importance and its claims. Christianity is many-sided ; there is a possibility that another, looking at Christ's truth from a different point of view, may embrace within the circuit of his vision something which I cannot see. God bless him in his efforts to make it known to men ! Single Christians and single

churches are but partial illustrators and reflectors of the mighty truths of the Bible,—

> "Hither, as to a fountain,
> Other suns repair, and in their urns
> Draw golden light."

But as the one colorless light, falling upon different objects, loses a part of its rays by absorption, and only blue, red, green or some other color, is reflected to us, so the one light of truth, reflected from different Christian bodies, loses it whiteness,—a part of the truth is lost in the transmission, another part is made too prominent, it may be,—all the rays of all the sects together, and not of one alone, make up the pure white light of Christian doctrine; and though we cannot understand the truths which many of these sects are striving to represent, though we have no mental chemistry which can now combine them, we may rejoice that all these scattered rays shall at last be reunited and form a circlet of glory round the Redeemer's brow.

For this very reason, therefore, that Christ has given to us certain definite convictions which differ from the views of others, are we bound to be faithful to those convictions, and to contend for them until we die,—our ray of truth is a part at least of Christ's light,—one element will be lacking if we hide that ray or put it out. Let it shine! Let it shine, and do its work for God, like the lighthouse on some rocky coast, lighting the track of safety to thousands of souls storm-tost and bewildered on the great ocean of controversy and speculation. The world needs that light; God has made us its keepers; from us it must go forth, if it is to enlighten the nations. Let us not imagine that truth of itself will win its way to victory and universal acceptation. Truth, without a body of believers to hold it forth, and a divine Spirit to make that exhibition effectual, is an abstraction and not a power. The cross that caps the dome of St. Peter's could never look down from its lofty height upon the myriad roofs of the eternal city, if it were not for those gigantic piers far beneath, which Bramante built up in the sixteenth century from the primeval rock. So there is no truth of revelation that has power to hold itself in mid-air alone. The church of the living God has been appointed to be its pillar and ground; its very historical existence as Christian truth rests on this, that there remains from age to age a company of devoted souls who give themselves to the work of sustaining and preserving it. For this purpose of upholding a portion of Christ's truth, long neglected and despised, God has given us our being as a separate Christian organization. If it be not our duty to use all lawful means for the support and propagation of our faith, then our very denominational existence is an impertinence, and our boasted truth is only schism and heresy. But if, on the other hand, we have built up our denominational faith upon the everlasting rock of God's revealed will, then to give up one inch of our position for the sake of liberality, or worldly repute, or wider influence, is simply to give up Christ and in that thing to deny him. To every taunting charge of bigotry, we can only answer as Peter and John answered of old: "Whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard." God has appointed that those who believe should speak, and that through their speaking the truth which he has committed to them should bring forth

fruit after its kind, until the world shall be covered with the waving harvest.

I have but one other thought to present, and that is that Christ requires us, in the propagation of his truth, to adopt modern measures for modern needs. We must not only defend the points which are most attacked, but must defend them by means suited to the emergency. In the Arabian Nights, there is a strange story of an evil Afrite whom a king's daughter sought to destroy. Perceiving her purpose, the Genie put forth his magic power and changed his shape into that of a roaring lion. But the princess possessed equal powers of enchantment. Plucking a single hair from her waving locks, she turned it in a instant into a glittering sword, and with the sword she cleft her adversary in twain. But the lion's head still had life, and ere she was aware it had become a deadly scorpion. Then she herself became a serpent to pursue him. But he was a scorpion no longer; transformed into an eagle, he was soaring far beyond her reach. Then she followed him in the shape of a vulture. Metamorphosed into a fish, he found himself chased by a shark, whose form was only the disguise of his relentless foe. Reduced at length to the last resource of depair, he turned into a flame of fire, but his enemy became a greater flame and devoured him. It is an illustration of the protean forms which error assumes, in its conflicts with the truth, and of the vigilance and flexibility with which truth must adapt her weapons of attack to each of them.

Of all the auxiliaries of error, there is none which for power can compare with the modern press. Truth must arm herself with the same weapon, if she would counteract its influence and take possession of its strongholds, — like David, she must take Goliath's own sword to behead the giant. But why do I speak as if the church were taking the weapon of another, when she used the press? It is her own, by right divine. The printing of the Bible consecrated it to God forever. Without it, the Reformation would have died in its cradle. It is one of those diversities of operations by which the Spirit, in his sevenfold energy, is renewing the face of the world. In the religious literature of the day, we see some glimpses of its power. Who can estimate what it will be in coming days, when history and poetry, science and fiction, shall all become the handmaids of religion, and each shall count it the highest aim of her ambition to receive the laurel from the hand of Christ!

It is the part of a true Christian expediency to bring the press to bear upon those peculiar errors which to our view mar the symmetry of modern Christianity, and hinder the progress of the gospel among men. We are confirmed in this belief by the wondrous blessing which, under God, has attended the printing and dissemination of our denominational literature. What one of us can look at Sweden with its two hundred churches established, and its seven thousand souls converted to God, without rejoicing that a publication of this society led Andreas Wiberg to devote to Baptist missionary work the energies of a consecrated soul! Witness the mighty progress of pure religion in Germany. See the fifteen thousand baptized believers who labor there for Christ, and then remember that the single grain of seed-corn from which this vast harvest sprang was a little tract of the American Baptist Publication Society, which led Dr. Oncken thirty-four years ago to embrace

Scriptural views of Baptism. And who can tell how many thousands, once dead in trespasses and sins, have read the tracts of this society, and reading them have seemed to touch the bones of some dead prophet, and to be raised thereby to new spiritual life. And this, my friends, is the work your Society is doing. Day by day and year by year, it is sending forth its leaves for the healing of the nations. Through its Sabbath school and tract departments it is reaching thousands upon thousands whom you and I will never see, spreading everywhere the knowledge of Christ and of his commandments. Like the *foraminifera*, those microscopic "toilers of the sea," — each one so small that a hundred and fifty of them, strung together end to end, would form a line only a twelfth of an inch in length, but which, with all their littleness, built up in the geologic ages the enormous masses of the Wealden chalk, and stretches of limestone rock, hundreds of miles in extent and thousands of feet in thickness,— these little publications which singly seem so insignificant, sent forth and scattered broadcast through the land, are building up whole continents of truth, and laying foundation for the future which no after storms or cataclysms can ever wear away.

Into this work, then, let us put our strength of money and of heart. We have no iron wheel of outward organization, revolving at the bidding of some central despotism, to fill our treasury. Let us demonstrate that the voluntary offerings of Christian love will accomplish more than forced levies can. Let us show that we value our principles, by our zeal and liberality in diffusing them. And while we stand faithful to Christ, and to the truth as he has revealed it to us, let us not fail to adopt for our own the reputed maxim of the noble Persians — ever to speak of our opponents in controversy with heartfelt acknowledgment of all that God has wrought in them of good, — for, after all, the differences which separate us are far less important than the ties that bind us together ; though we cannot now in all things see alike, we may still rejoice in the inheritance which we possess, as children of one common Father ; though the bars of outward organization render our union imperfect here, we may look forward with all the more of longing to that time when all these divisions of the twilight shall disappear in the sunrise of a fuller knowledge, and it shall be known to all the universe at last that there is but "one flock and one Shepherd."

XX.

UNCONSCIOUS ASSUMPTIONS

OF COMMUNION POLEMICS.*

It is often the serious misfortune of able and honest men, that they unwittingly argue upon principles which, when formally stated, they would unhesitatingly repudiate. Many attempts to construct new roads through the tangled wilds of the Communion controversy only result in the discovery of the old open-communion thoroughfare; and the rejoicing of those who make the discovery is partly attributable to the novelty of their situation, and to the fact that they have not yet followed the road through, to its disagreeable and unscriptural terminus. The best service that can be rendered to such as have thus lost their way, and have perchance led others into the same error, is to show by map and compass that they are journeying in a wrong direction, and that the path they travel conducts them to a very different point from that which they seek.

The first of the unconscious assumptions that underlie the arguments to which we allude is this, that the practice of the churches is a sort of common law which, when codified, may supplement or qualify the law of the New Testament. It is true that, in some professedly Baptist churches, the ancient principles of the denomination are not carried out with absolute logical consistency. In certain churches, there is a growing tendency to pass lightly over the question of communion-faith in their admission of members, and to refrain from discipline in cases where members practice occasional communion with churches not of our faith and order. We have sometimes known instances where orthodox Baptist deacons have not refused the bread and wine to Pedo-baptist brethren who took upon themselves the responsibility of remaining at an ordinary celebration of the Lord's Supper. These and sundry other irregular and exceptional cases convince our critics that the old bottles of ancient law are not strong enough or large enough to hold the new wine of Christian enlightenment and charity. They therefore proceed to elevate practice itself into law — to make irregularity its own voucher — to legalize license — to turn permission under sufferance into acknowledgment of fundamental right.

It scarcely needs to be pointed out that this is a method the reverse of scientific, evangelical, or Baptist. Here is unconsciously assumed the fundamental principle of all unprotestant ecclesiasticism — the principle that not only God, but man also, makes law; that the church, equally with the Scriptures, is the standard of appeal in questions of duty; and that the analogy of faith is to be looked to as a primary source of truth, instead of

* Printed in The Examiner, Jan. 21, 1875.

being a secondary source, of value only when it corroborates conclusions drawn directly and at first hand from the word of God. How far such a principle as this might lead, history furnishes sufficient witness. When stated in words, it would be rejected with marked energy by some who are dissatisfied with our common practice. This proves without doubt that they will not speedily go over to Presbyterianism or to Rome, but it does not make it any the less certain that their method is fatally incorrect, and that this seeking for the law in human custom and observance, instead of conforming human custom and observance to the law, would slowly, perhaps, but surely, work the ruin of the church of Christ.

But is there an original, all-comprehending, all-compelling law? Ah, that is the question! When our new guides speak of an authoritative order of the ordinances, we can hardly avoid believing that they have some just notion of a divine prescription which makes the yea and nay of men of little account in the comparison. But there is no explaining the conclusions at which they arrive, without allowing that there is a second underlying assumption equally erroneous with the first,— this, namely, that there is no fixed, complete and binding system of church organization revealed in the New Testament. It is possible to hold to an authority which is merely the authority of rational order. It is possible to believe in a merely germinal New Testament church. It is possible to urge the obligatoriness of church ordinances upon grounds of expediency. Our friends do not do this. But when they urge that impulse may break over this order, and that faith is above law, we seem to see the unconscious influence of some development-theory of the church, that gives to the free spirit power to mould and shape Christ's ordinances, or to dispense with them at its will.

There are two logical theories, and two only. Either the law of Christ is adequate, or it is not. Either men may change it, or they may not. Either the New Testament furnishes us with the model of the church, or it does not. If it does, then there are no exceptions to its rule,— a divine law is far-seeing, and needs no change. Upon this ground the Baptist brotherhood have stood, and do stand. But there is other ground, not so Scriptural, but yet logically consistent with itself. It is the ground that there is no definite or adequate model of church-organization in the New Testament — at least, none that binds the conscience and practice of the church through all time. Upon this theory, a man may unite himself to the Christian church and submit to her ordinances, according as he finds it expedient or convenient. Truth in this matter is entirely subjective. The church, like an ox-yoke, is useful,— when its apparent usefulness ceases, let it go. The Christian's individual relation to Christ, this is the only real and binding thing. Churches are chance assemblages of believers. Church organization expresses no living truth,— let it follow the customs of the times or the inclination of the moment. Church government,— let it be autocratic in Italy, democratic in America, and double-headed in Japan. God has planned a gospel for all men, but he has not planned a church. And then, if the New Testament is not a sufficient authority for practice, what reason is there to believe that it is a sufficient authority for doctrine?

Shall we be Plymouth Brethren, or shall we be Baptists? Either one of the two we can be, and preserve some show of logical consistency. But to

be both at once,— that is a riding of two horses which is not only difficult, but for any length of time impossible to a thinking man. And why should we attempt impossible tasks? We have such a thing as church organization in the New Testament. There are specified qualifications for membership; there are stated meetings; there are regularly elected officers; there is a custom sanctioned and an order enjoined by the apostles; there are ordinances delivered to the care of the church; there are letters and contributions and registers; there is common work to be done; there is common discipline to be exercised, — what more do we need to constitute a thorough organization? And if Christ's promise was fulfilled, and the divine Spirit led the Apostles into all truth, in their church-teaching and church-building, then what right have we to admit exceptions to the acknowledged order of God's house? Our rights in such an organization are not rights — they are only privileges, whose enjoyment is conditioned upon obedience; and faith carries with it the privilege of Communion, only as it implies obedience to all things which Christ has commanded.

But let us come to a third assumption,— still remembering that none of these are acknowledged or could be in words — for they are too baldly false for any Baptist openly to acknowledge. It is an assumption, nevertheless, without which the fabric of the new doctrine would topple over for sheer one-sidedness. It is this: The ordinances are purely formal and external, instead of being living expressions of the inmost realities of the Christian faith. Some such postulate as this must be supposed, before we can comprehend such statements as that the ritual is so subordinate to the spiritual, that no ritual deficiencies can justly prevent the exercise of so called spiritual rights. By what strange confusion is it possible to demand ceremonial privileges without ceremonial qualifications? Only by forgetting that all ritual of God's appointment is profoundly spiritual, and that disorder in ritual falsifies the truth which the ritual was ordained to symbolize and represent. Why do we hold so strenuously to the duty and privilege of Christian baptism? Because of the meaning of a Greek word, or an æsthetic fancy for a form? God forbid! We hold to baptism, because it is the divinely appointed vehicle and symbol of the great central truth of the Christian scheme — the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and our death to sin and resurrection to new life in him. Why do we hold to the invariable precedence of Baptism to the Supper? Because the ordinance which symbolizes regeneration must go before the ordinance which symbolizes sanctification, as birth must go before nourishment, and life before its sustenance. Instead of being void of doctrinal significance, these ordinances and their order are doctrines incarnate. Give up immersion, and you destroy one great memorial of the Savior's death and of the radical change which, by communion with that death, is wrought in every believing soul. Alter the order of the ordinances — grant that men are qualified to partake of the Lord's Supper without Baptism, and you teach the world that men may be sanctified without regeneration; that there can be a holy life without the new-creating power of God.

And so the depreciation of the ritual leads to a denial of the spiritual. For the sake of the spiritual we must hold to the ritual. We are as far from believing in a special sacramental grace, communicated after some outward

fashion through the ordinances, as any Swiss Reformer ever was. But all the more sacred do the ordinances and their appointed order seem to us, when we remember that their only power is the power they exert as monumental symbols of the saving truth of God. To change them, or to permit their change without protest, is more than to give up a form; it is to strike a blow at the very heart of the Christian faith. For this reason it seems to us that the indirect apology for violations of the Scriptural order to which we have alluded, and the suggestion that impulse and sentiment may justify a Christian in overriding that order, can have no other foundation than an unconscious assumption that Christ's ordinances are, like some human ordinances, mere matters of form, instead of being what they are, full of spirit and life.

A last assumption which we must notice is, that the *laissez faire*, or let-alone principle, will ensure the downfall of error, and the peace and progress of the church. There are a multitude of quiet brethren who, like Erasmus, deplore so great strife about matters so small. Alas, that we should find some of our own brethren among those who count the difference between truth and error, even in the matter of the ordinances, unworthy of the baring of their swords! Let them deplore it as they will, yet they cannot ignore the fact that the battle would never have raged for centuries around these ordinances, if they had not been the symbols of God's truth and the banners of the church. It is because the family, the State and the church are divine in their origin, that they are so constantly attacked by errorists of every sort. It is because they are endangered, that the ordinances are delivered to the church as a trust to be guarded for her Lord. Nothing will take care of itself in this degenerate world — least of all, moral and religious truth. The church is its pillar and ground, — if she fail to support it and hold it forth before the world, the truth will go down. As to this specific matter of the order of the ordinances, history negatives the notion that Baptism can maintain itself when the church admits the unbaptized to her communion. If spiritual union with Christ justifies us in coming to the table without Baptism, it equally justifies in coming into the church without Baptism — it equally justifies any and every neglect, any and every sin. The religion of sentiment has many a sad illustration in individual transgression. Let the church as a body accept the religion of sentiment, instead of the warrior spirit that gives battle rather than yield one inch of truth, and the serpent she was to have trodden beneath her feet will strangle her within his folds.

We have a better hope for the church than this — a better hope for our Baptist churches. They have grown to be many and strong, by faithfulness to their convictions. They will grow in future, not by disobeying the organic law of their constitution, nor by welcoming those who disobey it, but by keeping the ordinances as they were first delivered. Upon the assumptions we have mentioned, no proper keeping of the ordinances upon the part of the church is possible. She is to set the table for all who choose to come. She is to baptize without question all who present themselves. If any theory could be devised which would more quickly merge the church in the world, and turn the Holy Place of the Temple into a Court of the Gentiles, we know not what it is. Nor is the simple maintenance of the Scriptural

order, as we understand it, Ritualism or Ecclesiasticism or Pharisaism. We pass no judgment upon the honesty of Christians of other names. We do not deny to their organizations the title of churches. But we do hold that they are churches irregularly constituted, and that their celebration of the Lord's Supper is a defective one, because they have not obeyed Christ's ordinance of Baptism. We give them fellowship in all else, but we cannot give them fellowship in their church-order and communion without stultifying ourselves, and proclaiming our own denominational existence to be impertinence and schism. Nay, we cannot withhold our protest against these irregularities without being false to Christ and his truth, and imperiling the whole future of his church.

Necessity knows no law, and David ate the shew-bread without disrespect to the Jewish ritual. But impulse and the yearning spirit are under law to Christ. Our love is to abound in knowledge and in all judgment. Because the Sabbath was made for man, we have no warrant for unnecessary labor on that day. That would be to deny that anything was made for man. In short, no such necessity is upon us as will justify a breaking over of Christ's appointed order. Love will not do it, for love will lead to obedience to the Scriptural standards, and even in the pain of sacrificing a ritual enjoyment, will find the evidence of its discipleship, and the assurance of greater nearness to the heart of Christ than irregular participation of the Supper can ever give. With sorrow we say it — but said it must be — it is the unfaithfulness of our Pedobaptist brethren to Christ's order that deprives us of the privilege of communing with them. We must hold them, and not ourselves, responsible for our loss. And we hold any and every attempt to palliate or ignore this unfaithfulness, to be not a help to peace but a hindrance ; not a contribution to the settlement of differences, but a mere patchwork treaty that leaves unnoticed every main question at issue ; not a synthesis of truths which, in spite of superficial antagonism, have an inner unity, but a formulation of essential and irreconcilable contradictions. For this reason we have confidence that Baptists will still stand for purity, and leave God to take care of the peace. Peace will come, not by the love that breaks down and overrides organic law, but by the love that holds and holds forth the truth.

XXI.

THE TEACHER'S GUIDE AND HELPER.*

This word "ministers" does not designate the class of persons whom we call preachers or pastors. It means simply "servants," "helpers," "purveyors." In this sense every Christian is a minister, for every Christian is a servant of the gospel. I take the text, therefore, as the basis of an address to Sabbath school teachers, and in fact to all who are called to instruct the young or to exert religious influence over others. All such are set in various ways to teach the truth. It is a most serious responsibility. Paul felt it to be so in his own case. In the passage that immediately precedes the text, he likens his teaching to the perfumes scattered to the air, at the triumphal entry of a conqueror. To the victorious soldiery, those floating odors were the signs of freedom and reward after the toils of the campaign; to the captives whom they guarded, those same odors were the sign that the time had come for them to die. So all teaching of Christian truth is, to those who hear it, a savor of life unto life or of death unto death. It makes a higher heaven for those who are saved, but a deeper hell for those who perish.

Every earnest teacher will surely echo Paul's own words: "Who is sufficient for these things?" It is well that he can add as Paul does: "But our sufficiency is of God, who has qualified us to be ministers or servants or purveyors of a new covenant, not of the letter but of the Spirit." It is the Holy Spirit of whom Paul speaks. Over against the powerless letter of the Old Testament or Covenant, he sees the Spirit of life and power that distinguishes the New. To be the ministers or servants of this New Covenant is to be the ministers or servants of the Holy Spirit. This is the characteristic blessing and strength of every true teacher that he is an assistant or helper of the Holy Spirit, qualified for this service by being filled and guided, illuminated and energized, by the Holy Spirit whom he serves.

We are familiar with the thought that the teacher is a minister and servant of Christ. We are not so familiar with the thought that the teacher is a minister and servant of the Holy Spirit. My object to-day is to show that this latter conception of the teacher's vocation is of the greatest doctrinal and practical importance. Not only God's methods and nature, but also man's ignorance and powerlessness, make it indispensable that the teacher should maintain this continuous relation to the Holy Spirit. The text implies all this. When it calls the teacher a minister of the Spirit, it implies two things: first, that he is a receiver from God; and secondly, that he is a com-

* A sermon preached before the Sunday School Convention, Boston, May 20, 1877, on the text, 2 Cor. 3: 6—"Able ministers of the New Testament, not of the letter, but of the Spirit."

municator to men of what he has received. Let us consider the teacher's need of the Holy Spirit from each of these points of view.

My first proposition then is this: that the teacher is wholly dependent upon the Holy Spirit, because God's methods and nature are such, that without the Holy Spirit's working there can be no reception of any spiritual blessing from God on the part of the teacher himself. Let us appropriate a phrase of recent scepticism to a Christian use. There is "a Power that makes for righteousness." That Power is no impersonal abstraction, but the personal Holy Spirit. And by this I do not mean that the Holy Spirit is simply the invisible presence of Christ. It is more than that. In a true sense, the work of the Spirit is a separate one from the work of Christ, and we may contrast the two. One feature of the contrast is this: While Christ is the organ of external revelation, the Holy Spirit is the organ or agent of internal revelation. And we learn what this means, by referring to our own inner experience. Christ had come, his cross had been set up, his death had been accomplished, his word had proclaimed salvation, but in spite of this external revelation we saw nothing in him to attract us. In his cross we saw no power to save. The great truths of Christianity were like the features of the landscape long before the sun has risen; mountain and plain and stream were there, but they were shrouded in darkness, or only half visible through the gloom. But when the Holy Spirit came, with his quickening power, it was as if, in an instant, that same landscape were flooded with the light and radiance of the morning sun. What was before hidden or uncertain, now stood out clear and bright and glorious. Mountain and plain and stream were there before; the light did not create, it only revealed them. So the Holy Spirit was the sunlight that made real to us the truth of Christ—truth which existed before, but which was as hidden from us, as if it had not been. Or suppose a blind man led out, in the broad noonday, into the centre of that same landscape,—you may describe the beauty of it, but to the blind man your description is but empty words. But now, imagine that some oculist of surpassing skill could, even while the blind man stood there, remove the cataract from his eyes, and perfectly restore the sight. At once the whole glory of the scene bursts upon him. So, until the Holy Spirit works a change within us, Christ and his truth are hid. They are there—eternal verities of God,—but we have no eyes to see them. Until the Holy Spirit gives spiritual discernment, and so turns the outer word into an inner word, the natural man will never see the truth.

This illustrates what I mean by saying that the Holy Spirit is the organ of internal revelation, while Christ is the organ of external revelation. But there is another point of contrast between the work of the Holy Spirit and the work of Christ. It is this: While all forth-putting, outgoing activity of the Godhead is the work of Christ, the returning movement, the drawing back to God, is the work of the Holy Spirit. Consider what this means. All forth-putting, outgoing activity of the Godhead is the work of Christ, whether it be exhibited in nature, in providence or in redemption. It is he through whom the world was created. He upholds and governs all things. Gravitation is the expression of his will. History is the marshaling of his forces. Incarnation and atonement are his comings into time, and creatureship, and obligation to law. Again I say, all forth-putting, outgoing activ-

ity of the Godhead is the work of Christ. But on the other hand, the refluent wave, the returning movement, the drawing back to God, is the work of the Holy Spirit. It is through the eternal Spirit that Christ "offered himself without spot to God"; it is by this "one Spirit" that the church throughout the world has "access unto the Father"; it is through him that fallen creatures are "convinced of sin," are led to Christ, and are brought back to God. All true worship must be offered "in Spirit and in truth." All prayer and service, all aspiration and all life, are normal and noble, and worthy of regard from God or man, only as they are parts or results of that great movement of the Holy Spirit, which draws all things toward God, their end.

Go with me yet one step further. We have been speaking of manifestations, but if the Son and the Holy Spirit are manifestations, they manifest something. Their work in time reveals a secret of eternity. The being of God is disclosed to us. Christ is the Word, spoken before creatures were, and when there was none but God to hear. God expresses himself, and knows himself, only through the Word. As the sun in the heavens is a true sun only as it pours forth its radiance, so God is truly God only as he shines forth in him who is the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person. The sunlight is derived from the sun, and yet is as old as the sun itself; and the Word is derived from God, yet there never was a time when he began to be. In the nature of God from eternity to eternity there is outgoing, expression, self-communication. Christ's "goings forth are from everlasting."

So the Spirit, and the work of the Spirit, belong not simply to time but to eternity. In the Spirit, we are to conceive of the divine activity and thought as returning whence it came, and as completing its movement. Here is a ceaseless process of the divine mind; but there is more than process — there is life, fulness of life, the energy of an infinite will, the blessedness of absolute and perfect communion. For it is a personal Spirit, just as it is a personal Word, of whom we speak. God without distinctions of personality would be the living God no longer, he would be a lonely being, dependent upon the unsatisfying association of a finite universe, or an unconscious being, destitute of mind and heart, and identical with the universe itself. If there be one God at all, then that one God must be in some sense three. If we give up the Trinity, we must give up all idea of a living Unity.

And so we reach the proper point of view from which to regard the teacher's relation to the Spirit. The work of the Holy Spirit is necessary to human salvation, because it is necessary to God himself. All his being is grounded in this life-movement of the Spirit, as it is grounded in the life-movement of the Son. Let us not make the finite and the infinite change places, and fancy God to be less than the things which he has made. The mighty tides of life that ebb and flow on the far shores of the universe, only shadow forth the unseen and unseeable floods that go and return within the bosom of God himself. All finite things together are but the "breath of his mouth," a drop of dew upon the fringe of his garment, a "whisper of him," while the "thunder of his power" is heard and understood by none. And all the operations of his grace are only partial manifestations of that transcendent movement which goes on forever in God. By working love

and holiness in us, and drawing us through Christ and in the Spirit unto the Father, he seeks to reproduce in us in our limited measure, the eternal process of the divine mind. There is One toward whom the whole creation moves, because it partakes of his internal movement toward himself. The Holy Spirit can save men only by drawing them into his own etherial currents of affection and will, and thus bearing them on to the meeting-point of all his blessed winds, in God.

If any have been impatient of this peculiar treatment of my theme, as if it were too mysterious and lofty, I can only urge them to a close study of Scripture, and of their own experience. The teacher who has wearied of his own futile efforts, will not think it impractical or valueless to connect his labor for the recovery of others to their allegiance to God, with the ceaseless divine operation which draws all things, by the celestial gravitation of the Holy Spirit, to himself. The Scandinavian mythology tells of a mortal who attempted to drain a goblet of the gods. The more he drank, the more there was to drink. His amazement grew, until he found that the goblet was invisibly connected with the sea, and that to empty it, he must drink the ocean dry. Surely there can be no comfort or strength so great as this, to find that in our labor for the souls of men our work is supervised and supplemented, and energized, by One whose resources are vaster than the ocean, and whose activity is as all-reaching as the tidal wave that sweeps round the world.

But my second proposition demands attention now, this namely, that the teacher is wholly dependent upon the Holy Spirit, because without the Spirit's influences, he is utterly powerless to communicate to others the truth of God in such a way as to sanctify or save them. For, mark well the fact, that the teacher is a real communicator of the truth. Divine efficiency secures and honors the active exercise of his human powers. The Holy Spirit does not supersede or absorb the earthly means. Mind is to be reached through mind and heart through heart, and, in a just sense, true teaching by true teachers is the salvation of the world. Now the first element of true teaching is a real possession of the truth on the part of the teacher himself. And by the truth I do not mean truth of science, philosophy or history, but that particular truth with regard to God, man, and God's way of saving man, which is made known in Scripture. "The truth as it is in Jesus," the truth adapted to man's religious needs, this is the special truth of which the teacher needs to become possessor, and which is to be the substance of all his teaching. This truth may take as many forms as an element in chemistry. It may be crystalized into the Bible text; it may be held in solution in the mind; or it may float about in the shape of airy maxim and unconscious influence. But whatever its form or distinctness, some truth with regard to sin and Christ and salvation is the agency in connection with which the Holy Spirit works every change, whether of conversion or of sanctification. The Holy Spirit makes sensitive the heart as the photographer prepares his plate. But unless the object to be photographed is set before the camera, and the light from that object is poured in upon the plate, no picture results. And so, in conjunction with the direct work of the Holy Spirit upon the heart, there must go the presentation of God's truth in its proper light, if that truth is ever to be impressed upon the heart and to leave its image there.

Let us never forget, moreover, that truth with regard to conduct, if it is to have this transforming power, must be incarnated in living persons. Abstract precepts do not move us,— they must be translated into life. Therefore it is that he who is the personal Truth came in human form, and lived a human life. One look at the suffering love and the atoning purity of Christ, can do more to melt and mould the hard and the selfish than all the maxims of all the sages. And this same necessity of embodying the truth, leads to the appointment of Christian teachers. They are to speak the truth, and to lend to it, as they speak, the vividness of present reality. They are to exemplify the truth and to show it in its results — clarity of thought, purity of emotion, loftiness of aim. If you once think what it is to speak to others the truth with regard to Christ, you will see that, without the help of the Holy Spirit, it is not within the power of man. To speak the truth, one must have the truth and know the truth. No parrot-like repetition of the words of Scripture is true teaching. The words of Christ — the real substance of what he spoke — were spirit and life. It is the ideas behind the words, that are to be communicated. And to get possession of these ideas is, to use a German idiom, to think one's self into God's thought; it is to press through the veil into the inner sanctuary of divine truth; it is to see it for one's self, as Moses saw the Shekinah-glory, and to come forth from the holy place, to speak it with burning lips and rejoicing heart to others.

I do not know how any human being can thus get possession of the truth he is to give to others, without the help of the Holy Spirit. I see the Ethiopian eunuch, on the desert road, wearily and vainly pondering the words of the prophet. "Understandest thou what thou readest?" "How can I except some one should guide me?" Ah, man needs a guide! The eunuch needed the guidance of Philip,— but Philip could never have guided the eunuch, unless he himself had had the guidance of the Spirit. Only that enabled him to speak as the oracle of God, and to preach Jesus so that the Lord High Treasurer of Candace's empire was eager at once to profess his faith in the Crucified.

I see two other New Testament worthies, making their way into the temple. At the "Beautiful Gate," there crouches the pitiful shape of a life-long cripple. There are few words from the apostles. But with the mention of the name of Jesus, that had wrought so many wonders, Peter fastens his eyes steadfastly on the lame man; he grasps him by the hand to lift him to new vigor and freedom; the very tone of Peter's voice electrifies the sufferer, as he commands him "in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth," to "rise up and walk." The faith of Peter flashes at once into the cripple's soul. He leaps to his feet, and praises God. It is a picture of a second element of all true teaching, namely, the believing utterance of the truth. True teaching is nothing else than a communication of ourselves, an impartation of our own life to others. Truth is not truth, unless it is enhaloed and ensphered in this atmosphere of faith. Teaching is not teaching, unless with the intellectual presentation of truth there goes the emotional intensity and fervor which indicate profound conviction on the part of the teacher. But with this element added, the least fragment of truth has power. The single word converts a soul.

Do you know any way in which a naturally loveless and apathetic person can be filled with enthusiasm in view of truth, so that he utters it with boldness and irrepressible delight? Contagious zeal — the consuming zeal for purity and for right, that like a flame of fire kindles and brightens everything it touches — have you any recipe for this? The Bible gives us one. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." There are little land-locked ponds, along our New England shore, that are shut away from the sea by heavy bars of sand. Weeks come and go, and the surface of those ponds is scarcely stirred. But on some favored day, a high tide overpasses the bar of sand; the half-stagnant waters are purified; the land-locked bay is united once more to its parent flood, and is stirred to its deepest depths by the pulsations of the great, deep sea. So they who in their natural state are sundered from the parent-heart of God, are brought by the Holy Spirit into union with him. What of themselves they could not feel, they feel now. The Spirit of God has communicated to them something of the infinite longing of God's heart, and his infinite love for the perishing. They not only pray with unutterable sighings for the salvation of men, but when they speak to them of God and of his mercy, it is with a confidence and power that none of their adversaries are able to gainsay or resist. And all because it is not they that speak, but the Holy Spirit.

True teaching has the truth, and speaks the truth with self-propagating faith. But there is yet a third element in it. Besides this real possession of the truth, and believing utterance of the truth, there is also a wise adaptation of the truth to persons and to times. "He that winneth souls is wise." The teacher has a work of spiritual surgery to do. He must lay bare the sore and ugly spots of character, that he may persuade his patient to undergo the divine operation and be healed. He must touch with his scalpel the tenderest part — the soul's self-will and pride. Blunt instruments and misdirected treatment will not do. He must not imitate the mistakes of the apothecary, and administer a composing draught to the already narcotized soul. And on the other hand, "the servant of the Lord must not strive." Unhealthful excitement brings, by necessary law of reaction, a spiritual stupor exactly proportional to the waste of nervous power. 'What shall I speak?' is a difficult question for the conscientious teacher; 'when shall I speak?' is a more difficult question still. "There is a time to speak and there is a time to keep silence" — and the suppressed anxiety of a faithful friend has often spoken louder than words. To be "instant in season and out of season," and yet to be "courteous to all men;" to "redeem the time," so that no golden opportunity shall run to waste, and yet to give to each, not another's, but his own "portion, in due season," this, in matters of the soul, requires a spiritual discernment that is foreign to mere human nature.

But the labyrinth has a clue, the moment the teacher regards himself as a servant of the Spirit. He speaks now "as the Spirit gives him utterance." He is practically, as well as theoretically, guided into the truth. He is enabled to interpret God's providences, so that they disclose to him his duty. And that, in no mystical way of new revelation apart from Scripture, but in the rational and Biblical way of quickening his intellectual powers, so that he exercises a common sense that is sanctified, and a judgment free

from selfish bias. Have you noticed the steady and quiet strength of the man who trusts the Spirit's word: "I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way that thou shalt go; I will guide thee with mine eye?" The Scriptures contrast the full tide of rational and satisfied life which fills the breast of the Christian, with the wild excitements and insatiable cravings of him whose dependence is upon physical stimulants. "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess, but be filled with the Spirit." No, the atmosphere of the Spirit is not one of nitrous oxide,—it is the pure, cool air of the mountain-tops of truth, and the more one breathes it, the more he recognizes it as a "spirit of power and of love and of sound mind." A wisdom that is not of this world, becomes his. The Holy Spirit makes him not only a ready but a trained and skilled assistant, in the work of bringing others to Christ.

Persons who are not naturally attractive have in these ways been made centres of saving influence. The bent piece of soft iron has no natural power to draw other iron to itself,—but attach it to the battery, and it becomes a magnet, that draws to itself everything within its range. Sunder its connection with the copper and the zinc, and all power is gone, but thus connected, it is its very nature to attract. So let God's Holy Spirit take possession of the teacher and he becomes a magnet, to draw those whom he instructs to God. Virtue goes forth from him. He becomes a living force for good. Borne himself upon the mighty current that sweeps toward the centre and source of all things, he finds that he is not left to go alone. Others are won to commit their barks to this same current, and so to accompany or follow him. Even though he may see no outward sign of the movement in himself, or of the power that he has on others, still he may be sure that the Holy Spirit uses him. You remember those Arctic explorers, who day after day with infinite toil and pain, made their way northward, as they thought, only to find at the week's end that their instruments indicated a progress of many miles in the opposite direction. They thought themselves going away from home and friends, but they found themselves nearer to them at the end than when they began. At last they solved the problem. They were not on solid ground at all, but rather upon an ice-floe of vast extent, and this whole mass, apparently solid as the granite hills, was moving toward the tropics every day upon the bosom of an ocean-current so broad and deep and still as to give no sign whatever of its power. So the teacher may seem to himself to be getting further and further away from the things he loves and the persons for whom he labors. But in spite of all appearances, God is furthering his work by invisible but tremendous operations of his providence and grace. He supplements our efforts, and guides them to ends which his wisdom, and not our skill, has set. Consciously or unconsciously, we are borne onward to the accomplishment of the plans and to the glory of the name of him, "of whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things."

Thus I have spoken of our need of the Spirit as grounded, first, in the methods and nature of God, and secondly, in the ignorance and powerlessness of man. Or to put it in plainer words, we need the Holy Spirit, first, because without him we can receive nothing from God. We need the Holy Spirit, secondly, because without him we can communicate nothing to men. And I have shown you that this last is certain, because only the Holy Spirit

can make us real possessors of the truth, believing advocates of the truth, and wise adapters of the truth to the wants of those we teach. But the Holy Spirit can make us able teachers. And the gift of the Holy Spirit is within our reach. The power to bestow the Holy Spirit, and to make men teachers of his word, was part of the Savior's recompense for his sufferings. He could not give the Spirit, until he was glorified. But now, he sits at the right hand of power, for the express purpose of pouring into us, through the Spirit, the inexhaustible fulness of his divine life. I honor Christ my Lord, not when I hold back, from a sense of my unworthiness, and refuse to believe that so great a gift can be for me; I honor him only when I take the gift, in the same spirit in which it is offered, and use it gratefully in the service of him who gave it.

The decision whether I will have this Holy Spirit, this present Christ, this fulness of power and blessing, rests in a true sense with me. Unless I will to have it, it will never be mine. I must put in the link of connection between my soul and God's efficiency, by the exercise of faith. There is a great reservoir of sweet and limpid water up among the hills, all gathered there by the art of man, for the supply of the thirsty town. Conduits are built, and pipes are laid; my own house is provided with basin and faucet; but still the water does not run, and I am dry. What is lacking? Nothing but the touch of my hand,—yet without that, I may go thirsty all the day. My friends, Christ is a reservoir in which all the resources of the Godhead are gathered up, and gathered up for the use of each of us. The Holy Spirit is the conduit through which Christ's fulness comes to us. And yet we shall never be practical possessors of his power, until by a personal act of surrender and of faith, we set the stream to running. Set it running, and let it never stop! Drinking it, you shall never thirst, and it shall be in you a fountain of water springing up into everlasting life.

There is only one thing more. Let this water bless others, as well as yourself. Our Lord did not forget this, when he gave his promise. "In that last, that great day of the feast," when he "stood and cried, saying: If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink," he added these words: "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his heart"—stirred as it is with new-discovered truth and purified by nobler affections—"shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which they which believe on him should receive." He only is a true servant of Christ, who receives in order to give. He shall receive abundantly, only in order that he may give abundantly. The spring that has gladdened his own heart shall gladden others. Widening and deepening as they flow, the waters from it, like those of Ezekiel's vision, shall carry life and verdure with them, until somewhere in the future, near or far, the ultimate result shall be the recovery of all the moral wastes that have been caused by sin, and the recreation of the earth in the beauty of our God.

On Easter morning at Jerusalem, the people gather together in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, long before the dawn, all carrying torches not yet lighted. The Archbishop enters the tomb in which tradition relates that the body of Christ was laid, and brings out from it a lighted torch, which he pretends to have been kindled there by supernatural power. One by one the people light their torches from its blaze, and others are lit from

these, until the darkness of the great church is chased away by the flooding radiance of many thousand lamps. The people carry the sacred fire to their homes, lighting still other torches as they go, until every Christian house in the great city is illuminated. So Christian influence widens and spreads. The fountain of its light and power is in the presence of the Lord — not in the sepulchre where his body lay, but in the secret place where the risen and glorified Redeemer meets with his chosen ones, and communicates to them his own life-giving Spirit. But he who has his own soul kindled there, gives light to those he meets, and is not impoverished but enriched by giving. Oh you, to whom is given the work of teaching others in the truth of God, regard the dignity of your vocation and fulfill it well! Recognize the Holy Spirit as the only source of power, and the Holy Spirit will prosper your labors! As you have the promise of the Father, put that promise to the test, and receive the Holy Ghost! So, enlightened and quickened by God himself, you shall be "servants of the Spirit," and successful participants in his great work — that work of which nature and history are but the preparation and arena — the work of bringing back a revolted humanity to its lost estate of holiness and of communion with God!

XXII.

COUNCILS OF ORDINATION:

THEIR POWERS AND DUTIES.*

In an age like the present, when laxity in doctrine abounds, and when men are not unfrequently led by unworthy motives to desire the pastoral office, it concerns the purity and even the existence of our churches to surround with all proper safeguards the entrance to the ministry. Such safeguards may in part be found in Ordaining Councils, provided that those who compose these bodies have proper understanding of their position and responsibilities. It is the object of this paper to present a just view of the powers and duties of such Councils, and to indicate the method of procedure best adapted to secure the ends for which they are called.

When we speak of the powers of Councils, we do not mean to intimate that these Councils are self-constituted, or that they have original authority. The Council, on the contrary, is called into existence only by the local church, can determine only such questions as that church may submit for its consideration, and has power to advise the church what its action should be, but no power to compel the acceptance of this advice. The so-called Council of Jerusalem certainly gives us New Testament example for one church's seeking advice from other churches, in difficult junctures, but there was, as we may suppose, an element of inspiration in that decree of "the apostles and elders with the whole church," which cannot be claimed for the conclusions of subsequent Councils. While Scripture favors that interdependence of local churches which results from acknowledging the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in others as well as in ourselves, and the due value of the public opinion of the churches as an indication of the mind of the Spirit, it still in the last resort throws each church upon its own responsibility of ascertaining doctrine and duty by individual interpretation of the divine providence and word. Interdependence, in short, is but the qualification of a fundamental and inalienable independence. On earth there is no higher authority than that of the local church. No other church, and no union of churches, whether directly or through its representatives, has any rightful jurisdiction over the single local body which Christ has brought into immediate subjection to himself as Lawgiver and King.

Yet all the more has the Council, when rightly called and constituted, the power of moral influence. Its decision is an index to truth, which only the gravest reasons will justify the church in ignoring or refusing to follow. If there is a moral obligation to seek its advice, there is also, in all ordinary cases, a moral obligation resting upon the church to take its advice, when

* Printed in the Examiner, January 2 and January 9, 1879.

this advice is given. So much, at least, is assumed when matters of importance are committed to the decision of a Council, with no provision for a subsequent meeting of the church to review the Council's action. In such case the church virtually constitutes the Council its representative, in effect deputes the Council to act in its place, tacitly accepts the decision of the Council as its own. The fact that the church has always the right, for just cause, of going behind the decision of the Council, and of determining whether it will ratify or reject that decision, shows conclusively that the church has parted with no particle of its original independence or authority. Yet though the Council is simply a counsellor — an organ and helper of the church — the neglect of its advice may involve such ecclesiastical or moral wrong as to justify the churches represented in it, as well as other churches, in withdrawing from the church that called it their denominational or Christian fellowship.

It is but an application of these general principles to a particular case, when we say that it is the church which ordains, and that in ordination the Council is only the adviser and assistant of the church. In ordination, as in deposition from the ministry, the church may, in extreme cases, proceed without a Council or in spite of the decision of a Council; the effect, however, being that such ordinance or deposition on the part of the single church has no ecclesiastical validity outside of its own body, and that the church may be even disfellowshiped by neighboring churches where there is manifest violation of New Testament principles in its procedure.

Ordination is an ecclesiastical act so important in itself, and so serious in influence upon other churches as well as upon the church that ordains, that the counsel of others may well be deemed obligatory before the act is consummated. In the case of deacons, who sustain official relations only to the church that constitutes them, ordination requires no consultation with other churches. Licensure, which points only to a temporary or experimental service, may properly be left to the wisdom of the individual church. But the setting apart of a preacher of the gospel to a permanent work of ministration in the churches involves so grave responsibilities and demands such practised judgment, that the ordaining church should never fail, where this is possible, to add to its own the wisdom and experience of other churches of the same faith and order.

The Council is called, therefore, not to confer upon the candidate, by superior authority, some special grace without which he could not be denominated a true minister of Christ, but to assist the church in two respects : first, in determining whether the candidate has been called and qualified by God's providence and Spirit; and secondly, in granting to him express authorization to exercise his gifts as pastor or teacher, within certain definite local boundaries of the church or the denomination. The prior call to be pastor may be said, in the case of a man yet unordained, to be given conditionally, and in anticipation of a ratification of its action by the subsequent judgment of the Council. In a well-instructed church, the calling of a Council is a regular method of appeal from the church unadvised to the church advised by its brethren, and the vote of the Council approving the candidate is only the essential completing of an ordination of which the vote of the church calling the candidate to the pastorate was the preliminary stage.

It has been proposed of late that the Council of Ordination shall consist only of ministers who have been themselves ordained. The proposition seems to us to contradict not only our denominational usage and principles, but the plain tenor of Scripture teaching. That Timothy is enjoined to commit the things which he has learned to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also, by no means defines the method in which he shall fulfill the commission. The analogy of the choice of Matthias, and of the election of deacons, would indicate that Timothy obeyed the precept by setting apart those who had been previously chosen by the suffrages of the whole body of each church respectively. All this was done by the churches under the advice of one endowed with special divine gifts, and clothed with unique and exceptional authority. But who shall be the advisers of our later churches in this solemn matter of ordination? This must be determined, not from the example of Timothy, for none have succeeded to his precise place and work, but from the general tenor of apostolic teaching with regard to the duties and responsibilities of all members of the church of Christ.

Careful examination will show that there was laid, not solely upon the presbytery or ministry, but upon the whole body of believers, the responsibility of maintaining pure doctrine and practice, of preserving and guarding the ordinances, of electing their own officers and delegates, and of exercising discipline. It is not merely the apostles and elders, but the whole church of Jerusalem, that passed upon the matters submitted to them at the Council, and others than ministers appear to have been delegates. The Scripture intimates that its own simplicity and sufficiency were designed for the very purpose of inducing individual interpretation of its contents, so that each Christian might judge of the correctness with which it was preached. How, then, can it be maintained that, in deciding upon the doctrinal qualifications of a candidate for the ministry, the laity are to have no voice? In many an age of church history, as to-day in the Free Church of Scotland, the Scriptural conservatism of the laity has been the most potent influence in preventing the general adoption of lax and erroneous views, to which the ministry have been inclined. Moreover the Council of Ordination is to pass, not only upon matters of doctrine, but upon matters of Christian experience, and of these the unordained church member is often a more sagacious judge than his pastor. As we see no Scriptural warrant for the exclusion of lay delegates from Ordaining Councils, but rather abundant evidence to show its inconsistency with the fundamental principles of a true church polity, so we reject the proposed innovation as having in it the beginnings of a hierarchy. To make the ministry a close corporation is to recognize the principle of apostolic succession, to deny the validity of all our past ordinations, and to sell to an ecclesiastical caste the liberties of the church of God.

The very first of the duties devolving upon the member of a Council of Ordination would seem to be the cherishing of a high sense of the dignity and solemnity of his office, and the determination to discharge his functions with independence and judicial fairness as in the sight of God. He has been called to be an adviser of the church of Christ in a matter affecting its very life. He is appointed as representative of another church, because in that other church the Spirit of God is believed to dwell. His business is to

judge of the work of that same Spirit in the heart and mind of one who claims to have been chosen by God to be his ambassador, and he is to reach his decision by comparing the utterances and the manner of the claimant with God's revealed will. Surely no more lofty or serious task was ever set for man to do. Frivolity, party-spirit, favoritism, personal pique or resentment, over-anxiety to please — in short, the whole brood of worldly impulses and motives — what place or right have they at an occasion so pregnant with blessing or disaster to the cause of our Lord!

But it is not enough to have the right spirit. It is a duty to provide against the wrong, and by all needful precautions ensure the issuance of a true intent in wise action. The Council does not come together to ratify the immutable decrees of the local church, but rather to give to the body that called it a sound and candid judgment upon the facts presented before it. The Council should therefore be so numerous and so impartially constituted that no danger remains of its being over-awed or unduly influenced by the hopes or feelings of the community or of the church. It is obligatory upon those who call the Council to furnish, in the letter-missive, a list of the churches invited, that the churches summoned may see for themselves that the Council is to be neither so insignificant in numbers as to make possible only a show of deliberation, nor so packed as to make possible only a predetermined verdict. Neither the ministerial nor the lay element should be relatively so numerous as to make it possible for one to override the other, and for this reason each church might well be invited to send only a single lay delegate with its pastor — an arrangement all the more valuable if the limitation of the number of delegates from each church should compel the invitation of a wider circle of churches. The church calling the Council should of course be represented by its delegates, but the number of these delegates should not be so great as to give undue weight, in the general discussion and decision, to the church's previously formed opinions. Neither the church nor the Council should permit a prejudgment of the case by the previous announcement of an ordination-service. The ordination-service should never be held or expected upon the same day with the examination of the candidate, for in every case of difficulty such an arrangement unduly curtails the Council's time for deliberation, and brings a pressure to bear from without, which involves danger of a sudden and a wrong decision. Moreover, while the examination of the candidate as well as his own statements of faith and experience should be in presence of the whole church, both for the sake of furnishing him the best introduction to their respect and Christian sympathies, and for the sake of furnishing the Council the fullest opportunity of estimating his ability to sustain examination, the Council should always conduct its subsequent deliberations in private session, and that this private session may be held, either the congregation should be dismissed or a withdrawing-room should be made ready for the Council.

The suggestions already made are embodied in the following blank form of a Letter-missive, in which it will be observed that the correct view of the church as the ordaining body is expressed in the resolve to ordain in case the counselling brethren approve the candidate after examination. All question with regard to the necessity of a special vote of the church ratifying the decision of the Council is in this manner obviated.

The —— Baptist church of ——— to the —— Baptist church of——— :

Dear Brethren : By vote of this church you are requested to send your pastor and one delegate to meet with us in accordance with the following resolutions passed by us on the ——— ———, 188– :

Whereas, brother ——, a member of this church, has offered himself to the work of the gospel ministry, and has been chosen by us as our pastor, therefore,

Resolved, That such neighboring churches in fellowship with us as shall be herein designated be requested to send their pastor and one delegate each, to meet and counsel with this church at — o'clock — M., on ———, 188–, and if, after examination by the Council, he be approved, that brother ——— be on the next day set apart formally, by public service, to the gospel ministry.

Resolved, That the Council, if they approve the ordination, be requested to appoint two of their number to act with brother ——— in arranging the ordination services.

Resolved, That printed letters of invitation embodying these resolutions, and signed by the clerk of this church, be sent to the following churches, ——, ——, ——, ——, ——, and that these churches be requested to furnish to their delegates an officially signed certificate of their appointment, to be presented at the organization of the Council.

Resolved, That Rev. ——— and brethren ——— be also invited by the clerk of the church to be present as members of the Council.

Resolved, That brethren ——, ——, and ——, be appointed as our delegates, to represent this church in the deliberations of the Council, and that brother ——— be requested to present the candidate to the Council, with an expression of the high respect and warm attachment with which we have welcomed him and his labors among us.

In behalf of the church,

———— ———, 188–. —— ———, Clerk.

A just conclusion of the labors of the Council may be either facilitated or hindered by the forms observed in its conduct. Although, in this, individual freedom and local usage must have their influence, yet there are advantages in uniformity of action, and it is with a view to promote this uniformity that we here suggest certain rules which already, in some portions of the country, have been found practicable and serviceable. Our present methods are too often loose and inefficient. Not unfrequently a moderator is chosen, before it can be told that there exists a Council to be moderated. Persons are counted as members of the Council, upon their mere oral declaration that a certain church has appointed them its delegates. Members of the Council are so scattered in the general audience that, in voting, they are indistinguishable from those who are not members. Candidates have been admitted to examination without presenting documentary evidence of membership in the ordaining church, or in any other properly constituted church. Severe scrutiny fails to be given to imperfect or unsatisfactory statements of the candidate, because of an undue anxiety to spare him what might be a salutary mortification. Good brethren refrain from opposing manfully the acceptance of an unsound or incompetent person, because of over-desire to gratify the church. These are ways in which the real purpose of the Council may be either endangered or altogether frustrated. There is a call for moral courage in standing squarely against either hasty or unwar-

ranted action. Where differences from the faith on the part of the candidate are not vital, it may be duty for a member of the Council to fall in with the general decision of his brethren. There are more serious cases, where dissent should manifest itself in protest and withdrawal.

As a safeguard against the irregularities already mentioned, as well as against other and more serious evils that might follow in their train, the following would seem to be a useful and proper order of procedure:

1. Reading by the clerk of the church, of the letter-missive, followed by a call, in their order, upon each church and individual invited, to present responses and names in writing — each delegate, as he presents his credentials, taking his seat in a portion of the house reserved for the Council.

2. Announcement by the clerk of the church, that a Council has convened, and call for the nomination of a moderator — the motion to be put by the clerk — after which the moderator takes the chair.

3. Organization completed by election of a clerk of the Council, the offering of prayer, and the invitation of visiting brethren to sit with the Council but not to vote.

4. Reading on behalf of the church, by its clerk, of the records of the church concerning the call extended to the candidate and his acceptance, together with documentary evidence of his licensure, of his present church membership, and of his standing in other respects, if coming from another denomination.

5. Vote, by the Council, that the proceedings of the church and the standing of the candidate warrant an examination of his claim to ordination.

6. Introduction of the candidate to the Council by some representative of the church, with an expression of the church's feeling respecting him and his labors.

7. Vote to hear his Christian experience. Narration on the part of the candidate, followed by questions as to any features of it still needing elucidation.

8. Vote to hear the candidate's reasons for believing himself called to the ministry. Narration and questions.

9. Vote to hear the candidate's views of Christian doctrine. Narration and questions.

10. Vote to conclude the public examination and to withdraw for private session.

11. In private session, after prayer, the Council determines by three separate votes, in order to secure separate consideration of each question, whether it is satisfied with the candidate's Christian experience, call to the ministry, and views of Christian doctrine.

12. Vote that the candidate be hereby set apart to the Gospel ministry, and that a public service be held, expressive of this fact; that for this purpose a committee of two be appointed, to act with the candidate in arranging such service of ordination, and to report before adjournment.

13. Reading of minutes by clerk of Council, and correction of them, to prepare for presentation at the ordination service and for preservation in the archives of the church.

14. Vote to give the candidate a certificate of ordination, signed by the moderator and clerk of the Council, and to publish an account of the proceedings in the journals of the denomination.

15. Adjourn to meet at the service of ordination.

It has been seen that ordination is essentially a setting apart, first, by

vote of the church, and secondly, by vote of the advisory Council. These two votes express both a recognition of gifts conferred by God, and an authorization to exercise those gifts within the bounds of the Church and the denomination. These two votes are parts of one whole. They show the candidate to be the choice of the church and of the Council — or, which is the same thing, of the church by itself and of the church advised by its brethren. Examination is a prerequisite to the decision of the Council, because if the candidate is to be recognized as a minister by other churches, he must give them proof of his fitness, and that all the more, if he come from a denomination whose doctrine and practice differ from our own. This setting apart by the church, with the advice and assistance of the Council, is all that is necessarily implied in the New Testament words which are translated "ordain," and such ordination by simple vote of church and Council could not be counted invalid.

But it would be irregular. New Testament precedent, which is the common law of the church, has, in the general judgment of our churches, made certain accompaniments of ordination not only appropriate but obligatory. A formal publication of the decree of the Council, by laying on of hands in connection with solemn prayer, is the last of the duties devolving upon this advisory body which serves as the organ and assistant of the church. This public service is not the essence of ordination, nor does it convey any new powers, much less any divine grace. Although, in the case of Timothy, there appears to have been a special divine gift bestowed in connection with the laying on of hands, the communication of miraculous or spiritual gifts was not the result of this imposition of hands, nor was it the object for which hands were imposed in his ordination; for hands were imposed, as in the cases of the deacons and of Paul and Barnabas, where no record exists of the bestowment, through that act, of any spiritual or miraculous gifts at all. The imposition of hands is the symbolic and public side of ordination, just as baptism is the symbolic and public side of regeneration. As the essential thing in salvation is the new birth of the Spirit, yet the entrance of the whole man into the outward as well as inward kingdom of God is not complete until this being born of the Spirit is formally and publicly expressed and symbolized by being born of water also, — so the essential thing in ordination is the recognition and authorization by vote of church and Council, yet the duty of the Council is not fulfilled until it has symbolically and outwardly proclaimed this recognition and authorization by laying on of hands and prayer.

Thus the laying on of hands is appointed to be the regular accompaniment of ordination, as baptism is appointed to be the regular accompaniment of regeneration, while yet the laying on of hands is no more the substance of ordination than baptism is the substance of regeneration. The imposition of hands is the natural symbol of the communication, not of grace, but of authority. If this distinction be only well observed, we conceive that all objection to the retention of the symbol must disappear. The laying on of hands does not make Spurgeon a minister of the gospel, any more than coronation makes Victoria a Queen. What it does signify and publish is formal recognition and authorization, and in this light the continued insistance upon the holding of a public service, of which the central feature shall

be prayer and the laying on of hands, may well be regarded as the bounden duty of every Council of ordination which, by vote, sets apart a candidate to the ministry.

If recognition and authorization be the essential things in ordination, decreed by vote and symbolized by public service, then important light is thrown upon the question whether ministers coming to us from other bodies of Christians should be ordained. The proper inquiries would seem to be these : Have they ever been recognized by the representatives of rightly constituted churches, after examination, as doctrinally and practically qualified for the ministry ? Have they ever been authorized, by the vote of such a Council, to exercise their gifts within the bounds of our denomination ? If not, it would seem that they still need ordination. Surely they are not now authorized to do what they have never agreed to do,— namely, minister to Baptist churches. The view that we should accept as valid some previous ordination in another denomination proceeds evidently upon the false assumption that action of every ecclesiastical body is valid, not only for churches of its own faith and order, but for all churches of every name. And no line can be drawn the moment we pass our own bounds,— Roman Catholic ordination must be valid as well as Presbyterian. Nor does our logic class us with Separatists or extreme Independents. In so far as ordination is an act performed by the local church, with the advice and assistance of other rightly constituted churches, we regard it as giving formal permission to exercise gifts and administer ordinances within the bounds of such churches. Ordination is not, therefore, to be repeated upon the transfer of the minister's pastoral relation from one such church to another. In every case, however, where a minister from a body of Christians not Scripturally constituted assumes the pastoral relation in a rightly organized church, there is peculiar propriety in that act of recognition and authorization which is the essence of ordination. And if it be proper that he be examined and his claims passed upon by vote of Council, it is equally proper that he submit to that formal service of laying on of hands and prayer, by which the previous action of the church and Council is simply published and symbolized. We are now ready to state in full that a regular ordination, conducted upon Scriptural principles, and therefore valid among all churches of our faith and order, involves three things : first, the call of a church to the candidate to become its pastor ; secondly, the vote of a Council to recognize and authorize the candidate to exercise his gifts in the churches as a minister of Christ ; and thirdly, a public service in which, by prayer and imposition of hands, this authority is formally and symbolically conferred. Of these three, the two former are the essentials, the last the regular and appropriate accompaniment. It is to be regretted that the word ordination, which in the New Testament covers the whole process of setting apart in all its three stages, should so frequently, even among us, be interpreted as referring only to the last. Thus the Council's final and most important vote is often a vote to "proceed to ordination." This intimates that the public service is the essence of ordination. The vote, as we have already intimated, should rather be a vote "that the candidate be hereby set apart to the gospel ministry, and that a formal and public service be held expressive of this fact." We have derived our denominational principles

from the New Testament, but the language in which we too commonly express these principles comes to us from the usage of denominations which deny them. It will be well for us to conform our terminology to our faith, lest our faith be gradually bent into conformity with our terminology.

The true idea of the public service, as simply expressing and formally completing the ordination, will determine to a considerable extent the order and relation of parts in the service. It is evident that the central features should be the prayer of ordination and the imposition of hands. This prayer, instead of being substantially anticipated in the opening invocation, should be reserved to a single brother in the ministry; and others of the older ministers, as a true presbytery, should, in connection with the prayer, if not during its utterance, lay their hands upon the head of the candidate. The prayer should recognize in the decision of the Council the new evidence that the church has been guided by God in its choice, and should invoke upon the candidate, as he is formally set apart to the sacred office, the blessing of God that is needed to render his work successful. These being the chief portions of the service, all the other parts should be arranged with reference to them. The sermon, if one be preached, should be a general presentation of the gospel which the candidate is to proclaim, preparing the way for the solemnity of the ordaining prayer, but not anticipating or superseding the words of admonition to candidate and church which are to follow it. Before these charges and after the ordaining prayer the brother, now already ordained in the fullest sense, may well be welcomed to the fellowship of the Christian ministry, with the presentation of the right hand and a few well-chosen words of Christian congratulation. That these many services may be impressive, it is important that each should be not only appropriate but brief, and with this view the musical portion of the services should be confined within narrow limits, and the utmost punctuality secured in the assembling of the audience and the beginning of the exercises. The practical and executive ability of the candidate may find good field for its first exercise, in preparing his church for this service of ordination. Well arranged and carried out, no service of all his after-ministry can be of greater value either to himself or to the people of whom he is the pastor.

The following scheme is presented as indicating an appropriate order of exercises, as well as the relative amount of time which may be granted to each participant in a service whose total length shall be two hours :

1. Voluntary — five minutes. 2. Anthem — five. 3. Reading minutes of the Council, by the clerk of the Council — ten. 4. Prayer of Invocation — five. 5. Reading of Scripture — five. 6. Sermon — twenty-five. 7. Prayer of Ordination, with laying on of hands — fifteen. 8. Hymn — ten. 9. Right hand of fellowship — five. 10. Charge to the candidate — fifteen. 11. Charge to the church — fifteen. 12. Doxology — five. 13. Benediction by the newly ordained pastor.

It has been intimated that deacons as well as pastors should be ordained. Although in this case, for the reason already given, the church may proceed without the advice of a Council, yet it would seem quite as clear that New Testament precedent requires the ordination of deacons to be accompanied with prayer and the laying on of hands, as that pastors should be thus

inducted into office. But is ordination confined to pastors and deacons? Analogy would teach that all whose permanent vocation in life is to be that of expounding the word of God should come under the same law, and should be set apart, in like manner, to this sacred work. This is especially important in the case of those who are to teach the teachers, as in our Theological Seminaries. Theirs is a grave responsibility; it should be intrusted only to those who, after careful examination, approve themselves as sound in doctrine and Christian in spirit. Every such teacher is to be regarded as a minister of Christ assigned to special service by the church to which he belongs; he should therefore be ordained with the advice of a Council, not to be pastor, but to be teacher,— ordained not by the Theological Seminary, which has no such powers committed to it, but by the local church with which he is connected. In like manner, missionaries to new regions abroad should be accounted ministers of the churches to which they belong, assigned to service in foreign lands; they should therefore be ordained by these churches. Philip, baptizing the eunuch, is to be regarded as an organ of the church at Jerusalem. Both home missionaries and foreign missionaries are the true New Testament evangelists; and both, as organs of the home churches to which they belong, are not under obligation to take letters of dismission to the churches they gather. Their ordinations, like all other ordinations, should be regarded as having no continuous validity after the facts upon which they were based have ceased to exist. Retirement from the office of public religious teacher should work a forfeiture of the official character. The authorization granted by the Council was based upon a previous recognition of a divine call. When, by reason of permanent withdrawal from the ministry and devotion to wholly secular occupations, there remains no longer any divine call to be recognized, all authority and standing as a Christian minister should cease also.

There are many curious and interesting questions suggested by this discussion, upon which we have not touched, and upon which no general agreement has yet been reached among us. We are convinced, however, that the principles which have been laid down afford the true basis for the solution of these questions, and that the correctness of the principles themselves may be either proved by positive Scripture statements or justly deduced therefrom. We have attempted to point out certain practical methods of carrying out these principles, and of guarding them from misapprehension and neglect. A thorough exhibition of them as centering in the direct subjection of each church, as of each soul, to Christ the Lord, and an application of them to all the practical exigencies of our church and denominational life, is yet a work of the future.

XXIII.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

ON YOUNG MEN IN COURSES OF PREPARATORY STUDY.*

Just a hundred years ago this very morning, behind some half-finished earth-works and a rail fence filled in with new-mown hay, about a thousand undisciplined militia-men undertook to defend Breed's Hill, near Boston, from the attack of two thousand British regulars. It was a hotter day than this has been, and the red-coats, heavily laden with rations for themselves and ball-cartridges for the Yankees, moved slowly up toward the fortifications which these latter had been throwing up during the night. Putnam and Prescott went about among our men, saying: "Aim low; wait till you can see the whites of their eyes!" That waiting was a test of of courage,— it is not easy to wait with a mighty column of troops moving upon you. But the raw recruits did wait till the British were only ten rods away, and then, taking sure and deadly aim, they fired. With that fire, scores of the advancing soldiers fell; the survivors faltered and began retreat. Their officers drove them back, and even pricked them with their swords to prevent their running away; reinforcing columns advanced; a second charge was made, but as before, half of the attacking force fell before the withering fire. If the Americans had only been provided with powder, they might have won the day,— but one round more exhausted their ammunition, and at the third general advance of the British, our men were obliged to retire. The battle commonly called Bunker Hill had been fought, and the inspiration and the lessons of it had become matters of history. Lost though it was, it was as good as a battle gained. It convinced our countrymen that war was upon them, and that they must fight it through. It nerved America for the long and bitter conflict that followed, by proving that British regulars were no more than a match for American volunteers. It furnished the type and seed of many after battles and of that final victory, which was gained by patience and fortitude and trust in God and the shedding of patriotic blood.

Here in these pleasant seats of learning and of religion, and at this quiet hour, there are no counter-signs and sentries and roll-calls after battle, and groans of wounded men, such as were there at Bunker Hill on the evening of that 17th of June, a hundred years ago. But I cannot repress the feeling that we are deciding the future, and planting the seeds of greatness or of shame, as really as they did then. A few men like Warren, who were willing to give their lives for their country, determined that day their country's

* An address written for the Anniversary of Peddie Institute, Hightstown, N. J., June 17, 1875.

position among the nations of the earth. And so you, in these preparatory schools, and in these societies that represent and adorn them, stand at the fountain head of coming history. What you are and what you do and what you resolve here, will make its mark not only upon your own lives but upon the character and fate of this and of other generations. We cannot estimate too highly the importance of this early work and of the decisions which are now made. Our philosophers and educators are coming to see that the elementary drill determines the future of the student and of the man. Let the primary instruction be absolutely thorough, and subsequent advancement will be natural and rapid. Let the boy begin his Latin with a listless and indolent and superficial spirit, and all after opportunities will serve him in vain. And so with regard to early impulses and aspirations. The first notions with regard to one's calling in life, and to the honorableness and advantage of the several pursuits in which men's hands and hearts are engaged, have much to do with the forming of the young man's character and the determining of his after failure or success. And this thought leads me to the subject of my address this evening. I wish to speak to you with regard to one of these pursuits in life, which is seldom formally commended to young men, but in which we all ought to be deeply interested. Standing, as I do, in a place where proper thoughts of it are so much to be desired, both for the sake of those who are planning their life-work, as well as for the sake of the church and the world, I feel called to speak to you for a few moments of the nature of the Christian ministry and its claims upon young men in course of study, as a pursuit worthy in itself, attractive in its surroundings, noble in its results.

I do not need to say more than a single word with regard to the nature of the Christian ministry. We all agree that there is a class of men set apart to be special representatives and spokesmen for God — to make known his will, to vindicate his claims, to proclaim his goodness, to win men to his service and love. There have been false priests and ministers, but they have only been counterfeits of the true, and their success has been possible only because there is an instinct in the human heart that bids it hope and wait for a revelation from God. The world has bowed to priests more than it ever has to kings, and that for the reason that the world has always recognized that its highest, grandest interests lay in the unseen and eternal. And now to be a true interpreter of this unseen universe to men who long eagerly to solve its problems, to be the messenger of forgiveness and peace from this dread yet loving God, from whom men know themselves to be exiled and banished by reason of transgression, to be the divinely appointed helper of all righteousness and herald of immortal life to the sorrowing and perishing,— this is a higher vocation than any other known to men, by as much as it has to do with grander themes and more important destinies. Other callings, however noble, have to do with the finite and temporal,—this with the infinite and eternal. He who is honored with this calling is the partner of the living God in that work for the doing of which the floor of the heavens was laid with its mosaic of constellations, and the curtain of night and chaos rose at the creation.

But let my position and aim be fully understood. I do not take for granted that it is the bounden duty of all men, or even of all Christian men,

to be ministers of the gospel. "No man taketh his honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." The Scripture tells us that "there was a man sent from God whose name was John," and that single sentence, like some painter's first rough sketch of a great picture, expresses, even more vividly than the finished portraiture, the essential secret of his life and work. John the Baptist was great, not only because he was commissioned by God, but because he knew and fulfilled this divine commission. But what was true of John's call may be true also of thousands whose special vocation is different from his. There are other callings, and many of them, in which men serve their generation by the will of God. Indeed, every man is called of God to do some special work for him, whether it be at the carpenter's bench, or on the quarter-deck of a man-of-war, or amid the strifes of the forum, whether by selling goods, or by healing men's bodily diseases, or by extending the area of scientific knowledge. And every man may find out what his calling is, and have the nobleness that comes from working consciously in the line of the divine purposes. Even though you may not be called to public preaching of the gospel, still you are called. As you value your interests for time and eternity, learn what it is for which God has created you and sent you into the world, and then give yourself body and soul to the work which he has for you to do.

But I am persuaded that God's call to enter the ministry is a commoner one than we think,—and that this call is often ignored by those to whom it comes, or if not ignored, at least questioned and resisted. This arises partly from wrong conceptions of the method in which the call is made known. Young men fancy that that call consists in some audible voice, or physical impression, or supernatural conviction of duty. I venture to say that many men are called who have never known any of these. Let us remember that God's Spirit works from within, not from without. The Spirit does not supersede our own faculties, but energizes and works through them. Himself inaudible and invisible, he makes us hear and see what truth and duty are. But then, if we be naturally timid and distrustful, our convictions of religious duty will partake of this timidity and distrust. We shall have to weigh evidence and act according to the balance of probability. In this matter of determining whether we are called to the ministry, therefore, just as in determining whether we are called to be lawyers or merchants, it belongs to us to consider our endowments and opportunities for culture, our natural and our spiritual tastes, the advice and opinion of judicious friends, the impulses of our hearts when we are most under the influence of the Spirit of God. And as, in the person called, God's work does not exclude but implies a natural process of consideration and judgment, so it does not exclude but implies the coöperation of others. That was a strange notion of divine sovereignty which used to forbid the mother from praying for her own child, or urging him to become a Christian. As if that would interfere with God's work! God's work in turning the sinner involves our work of warning and kindly invitation. And so God's work of calling men, into the ministry of the gospel involves our work of seeking out young men, and laying before them the needs of the world and the claims of the Christian ministry. Of old, the churches selected fit men and laid upon them this responsibility, and when they fled from it, hunted for them until they found

them and obtained their submission to the voice of the congregation. And modern times are not without notable instances of men whose first thought of preaching has been suggested by the formal action of the church to which they belonged. Mistakes have sometimes without doubt been made, and the voice of the church is not final and authoritative. There must be the inward feeling of the candidate himself responding to this call, if it does not, indeed, precede it. But this is what I urge — not only the privilege but the duty of Christian people to seek out those who have natural gifts for the ministry and who are providentially situated so that they can prepare for it, and to lay upon them the responsibility of considering and deciding whether God does not call them to devote themselves to the work of preaching the gospel to their fellow-men. It is our business to say to such young men, not that it is their duty to preach Christ's gospel, but that it is their duty to consider whether this may not be their duty, and, as a help to such consideration, set before them the real nature of ministerial work and the manifold arguments which incite a lover of Christ to enter upon it.

Such influence on my part and yours, is needful to counteract false impressions which have become prevalent in our day — impressions which work to the prejudice of the ministry, when its claims are considered by young men in course of study. We live in an age when the outward is all-absorbing. In the rush and noise and show of our money-getting time, the pursuits that are intellectual and spiritual constantly tend to be undervalued. Palpable results are sought, and it is deemed a hardship to spend in study the early years that might be employed in learning a trade or in gaining practical acquaintance with business. And so we have thousands of men successful so far as accumulation of property is concerned, who utterly lack the culture which would enable them to enjoy or to use their gains — men who know nothing but business and have no mental resources — men shriveled and dried up at fifty, when with early education their minds might be green and bring forth fruit in old age. In this over-active time it is forgotten that precocity of worldly development is really narrowing to the soul. Does the time of preparation for work in the ministry consume many years of youth? Well, it only prepares for a more vigorous and broad and joyful manhood — developes internal resources of knowledge and sympathy — opens deeper fountains of beneficent and holy influence. You have one only life on earth to live. Take time to make your preparations thorough. You have one only edifice of character and work to build. Take time to lay the foundations solid and strong. Learn a lesson from Jesus. He had the greatest work man ever had to do. Yet he waited calmly till his thirty years of preparation were finished, before he began it. If God had designed you to begin your work before the time set for the finishing of your studies, he would certainly have had you born earlier. Since he has waited so long for your appearance upon the stage, he can wait a few years longer till you are fully ready to serve him.

There are undoubtedly infelicities in the life of the minister of the gospel, and no man can serve Christ in the ministry without making great sacrifices. The ordinary minister must resign the hope of luxury and ease. Even the most successful will find that success is purchased only by care and labor. But is it different in other pursuits? Are not the great fortunes won by

prolonged and excessive toil? And what proportion of those who enter upon the professions or upon trade achieve a competence? A celebrated Wall Street merchant told me that not one in a hundred that set up business in the street survived the vicissitudes of twenty years. The vast majority lost property and hope. The great money-marts are strewn with wrecks, if we could only see them. While the ministry offers few golden prizes, it does offer as safe and sure a support to a faithful man as business does. As the result of extensive observation it can be said that "they that wait upon the Lord shall not want any good thing." Levi had no portion with the tribes, but the Lord was his inheritance. What David said of the righteous in general is even more true of the ministers of the gospel: "I have not seen them forsaken, nor their seed begging bread."

But since there are popular impressions of the sort I have mentioned, it is no more than fair to oppose to these certain undoubted advantages and felicities of the minister's lot. I do this, not to give a rose-colored picture of clerical life, not to influence any man to enter the ministry from worldly motives, but simply to counteract and counterbalance the false notions insensibly received from others. I feel that I can do this from experience as well as from observation, since I know of one ministry begun with many forebodings and with many inward and outward trials, which proved immeasurably happier than fear had prophesied, and which, now that it is past, fulfils the poet's declaration that "blessings brighten as they take their flight." We may safely compare the work of the ministry with that of other professions, as to the comfort of its outward surroundings, its influence upon the character of him who performs it, the nobility and permanence of its results.

I do not know any calling in life that has so attractive an aspect at the start, as that of the ministry. The young physician or lawyer, after completing his preparatory studies, has to enter upon his work as a stranger in the community and a competitor of those who have had the experience and the success of years. He seldom has the support and sympathy of influential friends. He must first struggle for the acquaintance and confidence of others. His first years are happy if he can secure a bare subsistence. Only in middle life does he reach a generous support. Wealth and position belong to advanced years. But the young minister, on the other hand, begins life with sympathizing friends around him, limited in number only by the membership of the church of which he is pastor — friends who are considerate and patient and helpful. They cheer him in his despondency and lift him over his failures. He has social position assured to him from the very start — access to the most intelligent company which his town affords, and a pecuniary support which suffices for the needs of a man of intellectual tastes. Absolved from worrying cares, and borne along by the consciousness that many a kind Christian heart is praying for him, he throws himself into his work with heart and soul, and gains his first experience of happy and successful labor in the service of Christ and the church.

But mere comfort, whether physical or intellectual, is of little importance, except as it assists the development of character and helps the great aims of life. The attainment of a symmetrical and grandly developed manhood,— is there any pursuit more favorable to this than that of the Christian min-

istry? Consider the variety of circumstances and experiences through which the minister has to pass. He has the life of the study. It is his business to keep his mind full of the best thoughts of the past. To freshen his public discourse, there must of necessity be a constant pondering of the noblest literature. History unrolls her panorama before him. Science opens her secrets. He has opportunities for general investigation and culture, denied to men of other pursuits. The lawyer can hardly give his time to philosophy or science, without prejudicing his success in his chosen calling. But the minister studies these as a part of his calling. He may learn much of political economy, of geology, of ethics, of art, not only without hindrance to his work as preacher, but with positive advantage to it. And we may safely say that, as a rule, the clergy of the country surpass men of every other pursuit in the variety of their culture.

But, with these intellectual opportunities, there is a peculiar field for the life of the emotions. The minister cannot become a recluse, for he must constantly meet, both in public and private, with hundreds of persons of every age and condition, must know many of their inmost experiences of joy and sorrow, and in this intercourse must have his own sympathies drawn out and developed. This wide circle of association, with its practical calls upon the tenderest feelings of his nature, furnishes a large part of the joy and satisfaction of a true minister's life. The world is full of sorrow; every house has its skeleton. Multitudes of people, even in Christian churches, have no one but the minister whom they can recognize as friend — no other to whom they can speak freely with regard to the things which concern them most. The minister needs only the endowment of sincere interest in such persons' welfare, to find himself master of their hearts,— he has but to keep open ears and they will tell him their doubts and troubles. And the telling is relief. The minister comes back from his round of pastoral work, thanking God that he is permitted to live, and knowing that, if only that one day's work were all he is permitted to do on earth, he has not lived in vain.

The Christian minister is in this way drawn out of himself, and made an open-hearted man. But it is not all a life of sympathy,— there is administration of church affairs to employ him, and the meeting of general needs of the community. The minister is leader of public sentiment on the great questions of the day. His work is to apply the law of God to public and private conduct. The range of his preaching is coëxtensive with the sphere of human knowledge and of human life. The word of God is inexhaustible, and he is to bring forth from its treasures things new and old. But he is to apply the principles of the word to all human relations. How profound the questions he must discuss! How grand the fields of investigation opened before him! How magnificent the influence he may wield, in shaping the thought and life of a whole community! In the last great war, the northern preachers were chief objects of the curses of the secession press. And the southern press was sagacious. It was northern preachers, quite as much as northern generals, that led us through to victory. They nerved the soldier's arm — they showed government to be God's ordinance — they made defense of country a duty owed to God.—Who that remembers those times can ever lend ear to the sneers of those who fancy the ministerial calling one of narrow opportunities for culture and influence!

A Christian young man, reflecting upon the claims of the different professions, must sometimes ask: Which of these professions will be most apt to make me a truly religious man? The Scripture has a sentence like this: Let not the rich man glory in his riches, nor the mighty man in his might, but let him that glorieth glory in this, that he knoweth me — that is, knoweth God. To know God, this is better than to know all things else, for the whole universe is but a wreath of vapor formed by the breath of God's mouth, or a drop of dew upon the hem of his garment. What life will bring me nearest to God, and keep me there? Now we all know that we grow like what we think most of. Which of the professions makes God the most frequent and constant object of thought? which most drives a man to communion with God? I do not answer without care. I know of such men as Sir Matthew Hale, the keen-sighted lawyer and the Christian judge. His work upon the bench did not prevent his daily hours of prayer. I remember the story of Havelock, the English general in India, who rose for prayer at four o'clock in the morning when the march began at six, and at three when the march began at five. Yet I think it cannot be denied that in the very necessities of Scripture study, and of preaching to the needs of souls, the minister finds a constant incitement to the cultivation of personal piety, such as no other pursuit in life enjoys. Ministers, indeed, may do their work perfunctorily and without converse with God, but such a course is suicidal; in this neglect, they cut the very sinews of their strength. If a man regarded prayer as the business of a life, would he serve his purpose best by entering other professions or by entering the ministry? And should we be far wrong, if we regarded a life hid with Christ in God as prior in importance and order to the outward labors of that life? Life first, and then work! And what pursuit can be compared with the ministry for keeping ever before the eye this need of converse and fellowship with the living God?

I almost reproach myself with having consumed so large a part of your time with the relations of this subject to the personal culture and growth of the man himself. I know it is not our own advantage that most inspires us. Youth has nobler impulses than this. How may I make the most of myself for others? how may I best make my mark on the world? how do most service to mankind? how bring most honor to God? — these are the decisive questions. And when we come to these, I think many can answer without hesitation: "In the Christian ministry." No other agency can take the place of the ministry. God has appointed it as an indispensable means of perfecting the church and propagating the gospel. No power of civilization or of the press or of the sword can ever accomplish those moral wonders which are brought about, when a man clothed with God's power stands up and pleads with beating heart and living voice that men will be reconciled to God. Who can look upon the vast audiences which in London and New York have recently been moved by the proclamation of the simple gospel, without believing that there are capacities of pulpit power yet undeveloped, and that the calling of the preacher has even a grander future before it than it has seen in the past? To move men in masses by the power of truth — this is the grandest work man has to do. Happy he who is called to engage in it. We may adapt to our purpose the simile of good Archbishop

Leighton, and liken the true minister to Amphion with his harp. Amphion charmed the beasts by his playing, and so moved the hearts of the very stones that they followed his music and built themselves into a city. But the Christian preacher, as the Archbishop says, builds "the walls of a far more famed and beautiful city, even the heavenly Jerusalem, and in such a manner that the stones of this building, being truly and without fable living, and charmed by the pleasant harmony of the gospel, come of their own accord to take their places in the wall."

While I deny that the outward infelicities of the preacher's calling are worthy of serious consideration by the side of the compensatory circumstances and satisfactions which are granted him, more attention is due to the inward trials of his life. Here I would not conceal one atom of the truth. The ministry is in its very nature a life of self-sacrifice. The minister is a servant by the very meaning of the word — first a servant of Christ, and then a servant of the church for Jesus' sake. And the servant is not greater than his Lord. The path he treads is the same path his master trod. His power over men is proportioned to the extent to which he enters into their sorrows and mourns over their sins. He cannot fight the evil of this world without appreciating it — and ofttimes being weighed down in spirit by the mass and strength of it. Like John, he will sometimes cry: "The whole world lieth in wickedness." Like Jesus, he will have his Gethsemane anguish over the condition of human nature without God. But all this, my friends, is only evidence that he has entered into the mystery of the universe, and gained a truer, deeper knowledge of the reality of things. He who knows holiness and God must deeply feel the contrasts which this world's life presents to all that is pure and divine. The soul that never has been penetrated with anxieties, and has never felt the pressure of the great problems of existence, has not yet risen from childhood to manhood. As Goethe once beautifully wrote:

> "Who ne'er his bread in sorrow ate,
> Who ne'er the mournful midnight hours
> Weeping upon his bed has sate,
> He knows you not, ye heavenly powers."

And so, too, there will be times when to declare God's whole mind and will to men who hate the truth, will task all his nerve and courage. Many a time he shall go into his pulpit, feeling that he takes his life in his hand. Many a time he shall prepare for his preaching by struggle and tears before God. But these are the experiences that make men great. These are the preparations that make men powerful. The thunderings and lightnings of the pulpit, that have stirred men's hearts like the peal and smoke of Sinai, were made possible by these inward conflicts and victories. The moving and melting appeals of the preacher, in which self was lost sight of, and the cross of Calvary filled the whole horizon with its glory and its beauty, were born of humiliation and supplication in the closet. Better a thousand times know these inward trials, than to float in air like the gossamer, and be blown hither and thither by every random breeze of this world's folly. May God make us men, and men of power in our generation, original forces to mould human society and turn the currents of earthly life into the channel of his purposes,— and with this end, let him fit us for our work by any discipline

that he may see to be needful for us. A young and brave Christian heart will find not discouragement but stimulus in this knowledge that the goal of the preacher's life is not to be won without dust and toil.

Out from the sorrow and sin of the world there sounds to-day the call for men to proclaim the glad news of salvation. During our late war, the drum was heard through our streets, and the call was uttered from pulpit and platform for men to fight for nationality and freedom. A great wave of enthusiasm swept over the land. Young men were ashamed to stay at home, and gave themselves joyfully to the armies of the Republic. We honor them to-day, and put their names side by side with those earlier heroes who fought and suffered and died at Lexington and Valley Forge. But there is a constant call for men to reinforce the thinned ranks of Christ's ministry. A hundred churches of note are looking in vain for fit men to lead them. And we have the word of the Lord himself, as he ascended to his Father: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature"—a word addressed to you and me as truly as to those who first listened to it. I remember well the time when I was first brought to consider that call. It flashed upon me that with every young man of suitable gifts and opportunities the *presumption* ought to be that he was called to be Christ's soldier and servant, and that the question with him, if he was a Christian, was not: "Are there any reasons why I should enter upon this work?" but rather: "Are there any reasons why I should *not* enter upon it?" "I have given myself to Christ," I said then to myself,—"why should I not do that work which will most immediately and directly bear upon the advancement of Christ's kingdom in the world? I expect to spend an eternity in praising and serving him who died for me,—why should not my life in heaven and my life on earth be all of one piece—all devoted directly to promote the interests and the honor of God? One only life have I to live; can I make that life noble and beneficent in any way so well as by giving it to the ministry of Jesus Christ?" Ought not these same considerations, that had weight with me, to have weight with some of you also?

The other day I stood in that grand Memorial Hall which the sons of Harvard have built to keep green and sacred the memories of those alumni and students of the college who fell fighting for the unity of the nation in our great civil war. On marble tablets beneath carven arches I read the names of scores upon scores of good men and true who had died for their country. The great painted window shed a subdued light upon the scene, and I trod softly as if my footsteps might wake some sleeper from his rest. My eye wandered upward and caught the words from the Latin Vulgate: "*Qui enim voluerit animam suam salvam facere, perdet eam; qui autem perdiderit animam suam propter me, inveniet eam.*" "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it." Was not the legend true? And does it not apply to all self-sacrificing labor for Christ—and specially to work for Christ in the ministry? Those young men whose names are now inscribed so grandly on their Alma Mater's roll of honor gave their lives for something grander than life—their country's unity and existence and honor. It was faith in freedom and free government that carried them through—and these things were invisible realities. But there is another government grander still—the kingdom of

our God — a kingdom which shall endure when all earthly governments shall crumble and perish. It is a nobler thing to give our lives to that. Those fallen heroes are joined now, in the nation's gratitude, with others of an earlier day who laid the foundations of our governmental system in their blood. Their reward is fresh and sure. But this reward of human fame is nothing to the reward of him who lives and dies a true soldier of Christ in the ministry. His is the immortal honor that only God can give — and the everlasting thanks of fellow-creatures, whose rescue from the corruptions of earth and whose place at God's right hand are due to his faithful service in their behalf. Dear friends, remember that earthly honors fade. Earthly mausoleums cease to be. To have one redeemed and deathless human soul as the monument of our life's work on earth, will be better than all the fame that has been won on all earth's fields of battle.

There have been men who have heard God's call and who have refused obedience,— but it has been only to lose in character and hope and true success for this world — and we know not how much in the world to come. We cannot safely cheat God. He will have his own with usury. There was Erasmus. Great scholar as he was, three centuries and a half ago, in those troublous times when men's minds were seething with new ideas of faith and freedom, he cared more for ease and reputation than he did for truth. He might have wielded a mighty influence in behalf of the rising Reformation, but he declared that he never was cut out for a martyr. And so while Luther was bold as a lion, Erasmus timidly concealed his sentiments and tried to be friends with the Papacy and with those who attacked it too. He sought ease, but both parties suspected him and denounced him, till he found his position of neutrality a bed of thorns instead of a bed of roses. He sought to guard his reputation, but he blackened it forever. Courting the favor of men, in a time when nothing but honest, outspoken decision for the right would do, his name has come to be a synonym for pusillanimity and moral cowardice. He sacrificed all his nobility of character,— and what did he gain? Nothing — absolutely nothing. He only demonstrated that he that findeth his life shall lose it.

But, says one, I am ready to do God's will,— but these feeble powers of mine — how can they accomplish anything in a work so grand and holy as you suggest? Let me answer, as God answered Jeremiah, when he protested that he was but a child, and could not take up the work of the prophet which God had laid upon him. "Say not I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee,— and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak. Be not afraid of their faces, for I am with thee to deliver thee, saith the Lord." Do you not remember how Jesus took the five loaves and multiplied them? It was a symbol of his methods in using the gifts of his servants. He takes the few talents, and makes them enough in number to feed a multitude. He takes the weak, and makes them strong enough to confound the mighty. Be sure that he never sends out a soldier at his own charges. He equips the soldier for the battle. None of us have ever yet begun to imagine how much Christ can make of us for his own glory, if we only put ourselves wholly into his hands. Without him we can do nothing, but we can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth us.

But this address is for all. It may be that the work of preaching Christ's

gospel, as his chosen and official representative, is one from which by special circumstances you are shut out. Still you may take the spirit and lesson of this occasion with you. The spirit is the spirit of service, whatever the vocation may be. The lesson is that, giving up our life to God and for God, we find it to our eternal gain. We find it in part in this world. There are precious and sacred moments in the history of the consecrated man, when for a little he seems to have found his true self and to breathe already the atmosphere of heaven. A moment ago, all things seemed dim and unreal,—now he sees God and spiritual realities with perfect clearness. I can compare it to nothing better than the change which takes place when you suddenly bring a microscope to a focus. The object is just before you in the centre of the field of view, but your object-glass is not adjusted to it—either you do not see it at all, or you see it very dimly. But a slight turn of the screw, and lo! it comes out before you as clear and bright as if it had been just created. But, you say, such glimpses of truth are so rare! Well, they they need not be rare. As you go on in the Christian life, the seeing habit will be more and more the habit of your mind—you will endure as continually seeing him who is invisible. All labors and trials will become helpers to you, drawing you nearer to God and strengthening your faith. Even the cannon-ball that brings devastation in its track shall open for you, near the spot whereon you stand, some unknown spring of fresh and living water. What a wonderful prayer-meeting that was which the Christian general whom I have already mentioned held in the idol temple at Rangoon! In the hand of each of the idol gods that lined the sides of the great apartment, his men put a torch, and by the light of these torches in the idols' hands, they held their worship of the Most High. So for all of us who give our lives to the service of God, the dark and trying events that threatened our peace shall be turned into torch-bearers to light up our worship and point out to us his way. But this is but the prophecy of another discovery to come. Only when we reach the city where we need no candle, neither light of the sun, shall we know what it is to "find our life." Christ is our life, and we shall find him, and with Christ we shall find all that we need—all that we were made for. Heaven will be the place, and eternity the time, for the manifestation of the sons of God. Oh, how we shall rejoice there, that we were willing to lose the life that was transient and earthly, for the sake of the life that was spiritual and eternal!

Just one thing more I wish to say, and that is, that this life of service to God may be lived by every young person before me. It is the very nature of the Christian life to implant within us virtues which we have not in ourselves, and to develop and strengthen them thereafter, until we and they are inseparable. You may by reason of certain experiences of temptation and transgression have lost all confidence in yourself. Remember that you may still put confidence in Christ. That is a most instructive example of Bishop Cranmer in the reign of Bloody Mary, the persecutor of the Protestants. You recollect how, in a moment of weakness and terror, he abjured the faith, and assented to the doctrines of the Church of Rome; but you remember also how, when reason and the fear of God returned, he repented of his sin and suffered at the stake, holding out first into the fire the hand that had signed the recantation, till it was entirely consumed. Christ gave his servant

strength to put away all his fears, and leave evidence to the world of his saving power that will remain to all after ages. So there is no one of you, however weak he may seem to himself to be, that cannot obtain strength from God to stand even single-handed for the Master. "Act then — act in the living present, heart within, and God o'erhead,"— and no man can measure the ultimate results of your influence.

When John Knox died, a nobleman at his grave uttered over his coffin this memorable sentence : "Here lies one that never feared the face of man." John Knox's voice had rung out like a trumpet through Scotland. Instead of his fearing the face of man, the wicked, even though they held the highest seats in the kingdom, feared him, as Herod of old feared John the Baptist. And what was the secret of it? Simply this,— he feared God so much, that no room was left for fear of man. Let this be my last word to the members of these Societies : "Fear God, and you shall have no other fear. Honor God, and you shall be honored by him. Lose your lives for Christ's sake, and you shall find them to life eternal. And in the great coming day, they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever."

XXIV.

SOURCES OF SUPPLY FOR THE MINISTRY.*

I wish to call attention to the fact that the proportion of our thoroughly trained young men who enter the ministry is gradually but seriously diminishing. The deficiency of which I speak is not confined to our own denomination. A few months ago I collected the latest triennial catalogues of our leading colleges, and constructed an elaborate table of statistics, in order to discover the precise proportion of college graduates that chose the ministry as a calling in the earlier and in the later decades of their history. The result was surprising. Yale College in the first years of its history gave seventy-two per cent. of its graduates to the ministry. Fifty years ago, the proportion had already become reduced to thirty-one per cent. During the last ten years of which the triennial gives professional statistics, the proportion is only eleven per cent. Fifty years ago, Williams College gave fifty-nine per cent. of its graduates to the ministry,—now it gives only fifteen; Amherst College shows a reduction during the same half-century from sixty-one per cent. to twenty-six per cent.; Hamilton College from thirty-eight per cent. to twenty-three per cent.; Brown University from thirty-two per cent. to seventeen per cent.; and the University of Rochester, which in the first ten years of its history sent forty-six per cent. of its graduates into the ministry, during the last ten years of which we have a record, sends a proportion of only twenty-two per cent. †

It is evident that we have before us a general fact of our times which ought to interest us, not only as Baptists, but as Christians. What we see of decline in this respect cannot be due to any special defects of method or administration into which our Baptist colleges have fallen. The evil is common to all our Christian colleges. The greatness of it may be partially appreciated when we consider that the result of averaging the statistics of the six colleges mentioned is to show that, while fifty years ago forty per cent. of our college graduates entered the ministry, we have now reached a time when only seventeen per cent. of those who have received a complete college training devote themselves to the ministry of the gospel. We may

* An Address before the Rhode Island Baptist Social Union, Providence, May, 1877; printed in the Watchman, Boston, October, 1878.

† An article by Rev. George P. Morris, of Montclair, N. J., in the Independent of January 12, 1888, brings these statistics down to the date of the present publication, and adds much of interest. The proportion of ministers among the alumni of Harvard College, from 1642 to 1650, was 55 per cent.; it has regularly diminished, until from 1860 to 1870, it was 8 per cent., and from 1870 to 1876, it was 1. 2 per cent. At Princeton, from 1748 to 1760, it was 49 per cent; from 1870 to 1877, it was 18 per cent. At Yale College, from 1870 to 1880, the proportion was 8 per cent.; at Williams, from 1880 to 1883, it was 12. 7 per cent.; at Amherst, from 1880 to 1882, it was 13. 5 per cent. These facts demonstrate that, since the above address was written, the decline has steadily continued.

appreciate it yet more fully when we consider that while the absolute number of students in these colleges has increased fifty per cent. during the half-century, the absolute number of their graduates entering the ministry has decreased thirty-three per cent. In other words, while our population has grown immensely in numbers and culture, the supply of ministers fitted by thorough training to meet the intellectual and spiritual demands of the time has not half kept pace with our growth in other respects, and is absolutely one-third smaller than it was fifty years ago.

The instances I have cited are typical instances of our old and large institutions. Have other sources of supply been opened which might render these unnecessary? New colleges have certainly been founded, and of their graduates some have chosen preaching as their profession in life. But the new colleges have not made up for the lack of the old ones; they have had all they could do to secure a foothold; have not graduated any comparatively great number of students; above all, have not sent into the fields covered by the old colleges enough men to make any perceptible difference in the result. And in the West and South, the graduates of the younger colleges show no more inclination to devote themselves to the gospel ministry than do the graduates of those which have been longer established,— in fact, I think it will be found that the influences which have led at the East to the results I have detailed, have operated yet more powerfully at the West, so that the facts I have stated fairly exhibit the real condition of things throughout the country.

It would be some alleviation and comfort if we could believe that, as the supply has decreased in numbers, there had been a counterbalancing increase in the native and acquired ability of those who enter upon the sacred office. But I fear it cannot be argued that better quality has made up for diminished quantity. The average amount of talent in a hundred or a thousand young men is a pretty constant quantity. When you diminish the number, you diminish your chances of finding among the number men of superior ability. We have better schools, better methods, better training, than we had fifty years ago, but these do not compensate for the lack of the best sort of raw material. No amount of grinding or polishing will give a good edge to a tool of soft iron. Schools, however excellent, cannot transform second-rate men into first-rate ministers. And it seems to me that I perceive a marked and increasing disposition on the part of the ablest and most influential men in our college classes to turn away from the ministry to other pursuits, so that the proportion of talent entering the ministry is even less than the proportion of numbers.

But are there not a multitude of ministers who can find no pastoral charge? I am reminded of an anecdote of Daniel Webster. He was asked by a young man who proposed to study law, whether there was any room at the bar. "O, yes," said Mr. Webster, "plenty of room, high up!" So there might be a minister at every cross-road, and yet a thousand churches be begging in vain for pastors thoroughly fitted for their work. Of this last sort there is no overplus, but a great and constantly increasing dearth. The culture of our communities has proceeded faster than the culture of our ministry. We must provide a more advanced culture, and we must give the best brains of our sons to receive it, or the civilization of the age will run away from the church.

Let us face the problem. We have before us a phenomenon of our times — a continually growing tendency among our educated young men to enter upon other vocations rather than the ministry. I wish, if possible, to assign some of the chief causes of this tendency, that we may wisely labor to counteract it. It seems to me that we shall not reach the root of the matter unless we grant that for this general phenomenon of our Christianity, which manifests itself in Germany and England as well as in the United States, we must find a subtle, potent and pervasive cause in the philosophical spirit of our time. Every generation has its philosophy. Man knows two things, body and soul, matter and mind ; and according as one or the other absorbs his attention, he becomes a materialist or an idealist. But neither materialism nor idealism by itself can long content the thinker, and so the pendulum of philosophic thought swings between the two extremes. Not half a century ago the idealistic transcendentalism of Germany was the great danger against which we had to guard. But this generation of Germans has seen the lecture-rooms of the Hegelian philosophers deserted. Physical science is taught in them now. The pendulum has swung to the materialistic extreme. The current philosophy in scientific circles is a philosophy of the senses. Matter is all and in all. Or if mind and matter be distinguishable, they are both but the opposite sides or manifestations of an unknowable force, which is conceived of under physical analogies, so that the priority of spirit is practically denied.

The late lamented President Talbot used to say that he liked metaphysics, because they had to do with realities. Our age denies the very existence of those realities with which intellectual and moral philosophy has to do. A mist has risen from the low grounds of physical research, and has obscured the great spiritual facts and existences in presence of which the human spirit used to rejoice and tremble. Our literature is full of evolution and natural law, — but the God who works miracles, and has personal dealings with the soul, is far away. The young men in our colleges get ideas from Herbert Spencer, as well as from the Sabbath sermon. They may be Christian young men, and their faith may not be absolutely destroyed, — the Christian college is the best of all places to meet the infidel reasoning, and to overcome it. Yet these young men breathe the atmosphere of their time, and it is an atmosphere of doubt and questioning. Is it a wonder that the unseen and eternal should become so dimmed to their vision, that a life devoted to teaching about these invisible things should seem hardly substantial enough to attract them ?

And while the hold of spiritual realities is weakened, the material progress of the age strongly impresses the youthful mind. Commerce and invention have opened many a new world to the enthusiastic adventurer. Years ago there used to be only three learned professions — law, medicine, and theology. But there are a dozen to-day. Architecture, the fine arts, literature, journalism, chemistry, banking, mining, offer brilliant prizes to the capable and industrious — prizes compared with which the returns of the pastorate seem very meagre and precarious, and the life of the pastorate very narrow and confined. The world has shot forward along the line of industrial discovery and achievement. Railroading and manufactures require a very high order of genius and discipline to organize and conduct them, and these

pursuits offer pecuniary compensations which the ministry cannot. The style of living in which cultivated people indulge has advanced in elaborateness and expensiveness much faster than the minister's salary has increased. All these things our young men see. To the best of the Christian students in our colleges, Satan offers, as he offered to Christ, all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, if they will but choose a secular calling rather than the ministry. I almost wonder that, in this age of materialistic thought and of physical progress, any are found to give themselves to Christ's service as preachers of His gospel. I should actually wonder, if I did not know that young hearts are not always sordid and selfish, and that the Spirit of Christ can touch them with the fire of self-sacrificing love. Let us appreciate the nature of the decision, when the spirit of the age yields to the Spirit of Christ, and our young men give up their hopes of worldly preferment to engage in a service so self-denying as that of the average ministry.

The second cause of the diminishing supply of educated men for the ministry is to be found in what I may call the secularization of our colleges. That I may not seem to use this phrase in any invidious sense, let me explain my meaning. It is a fact we need to consider, that even our Christian colleges, as distinguished from State institutions, have been more and more becoming places of secular, rather than religious, training. This is partly an incident of their general advance in methods. In early days the college was looked upon chiefly as a feeder for the ministry; it was indeed a college and a theological seminary combined. If others than incipient preachers studied in it, they were those who had in view one of the other learned professions, law or medicine. Now it is a mark of progress, upon which we ought to congratulate ourselves, that all classes of the community are coming to feel the advantages of a thorough education, and the farmer, the manufacturer and the merchant desire their sons to have a liberal training, even though they are to follow the calling of their fathers. The colleges have felt this demand, and have opened their doors to all. They give a broader and more varied culture than they gave fifty years ago. They have widened the range of their curriculum to embrace the new science of the day, at the same time that they have widened the compass of their halls to take in the candidates for every conceivable human calling.

The results of this are easily seen. The colleges have now a smaller proportion of Christian students. Much of the instruction formerly given in Biblical studies and in Christian doctrine is given no longer. The theological seminary has sprung up to give a specifically theological training, and as the college and the seminary have become more and more differentiated, the work formerly done by the one is relegated to the other. No college that I know of has any such course of sermons on the Christian evidences and on the Christian doctrine, as Dr. Timothy Dwight preached in the chapel of Yale College a hundred years ago. The young collegian who proposes to study law has no such instruction in theology as legal fledglings had then. Then many a lawyer had tastes for Biblical and theological study awakened in college which afterwards led to theological authorship, and reacted powerfully and beneficially upon the work of his chosen profession. It would be well if the men of other professions could have some such training in theology now. Why is it that all other sciences are supposed to form a

necessary part of a liberal education, while no place can be found in a college curriculum for the most important of all, the science of God?

So the college has become more collegiate, and the theological seminary more theological. It is the old principle of the division of labor. But it has its disadvantages. With a greater proportion of students bent on secular pursuits, there has been a natural diversion of thought from religion itself. Instructors being chosen not so much for their religious spirit as for their competence in special departments of teaching, there is naturally a less regard on their part for the religious welfare of the students under their care. The days of wide-spread revival in our colleges, those days of struggle and prayer when the college world was shaken to its foundations, and universal awe was felt at the manifest presence of God, are almost things of the past. Those were the days when young men felt the claims of Christ and his ministry, and in submitting themselves to God, gave themselves also to the preaching of the gospel. Now the secular element is so dominant that a strong public sentiment in behalf of religion is difficult to arouse. The Christian element among students and professors holds its own, but it does little more. I am perfectly aware that the old curriculum and the old methods can never be restored, but I trust in God that the day will come when the old revival spirit will fall upon our colleges, and when each of them may have for its motto the old legend upon the seal of Harvard, "*Christo et ecclesiæ.*" The studies of the colleges may be secular, but their spirit may be religious. These colleges were all founded in prayer and tears, by men of God who felt that education without religion was not only no true education, but was a curse to those who received it. I cannot believe that the spirit of the founders has spent itself and is gone. But it greatly needs to be revived, and for this every Christian should devoutly pray, for the future of the Christian cause is bound up with the religious condition of our colleges.

I wish now to speak of a third and last cause for the disinclination of our educated young men to enter the ministry, namely, a gradual change of view among the members of our churches with regard to the ministry itself as a divine calling. I do not now refer to the disappearance of that adventitious dignity of ecclesiasticism which once surrounded the minister and separated him in the popular regard from all others of human kind. We who live in this generation can hardly picture to ourselves the solemn sanctity that invested his office in old New England days. That was a time when, the moment the minister and his family left the parsonage to walk to the church on Sabbath days, every parishioner, young and old, stood still by the road-side with uncovered head until the procession passed. When the minister's family filed into the meeting-house two by two, the whole congregation rose to receive them, and remained standing until the minister had taken his seat in the pulpit, and his family had taken their seats in the pew. That old ecclesiasticism often bolstered up a miserable sloth and formality, and though it originated in real reverence for sacred things, it tended to withdraw the minister from the sympathies of his people and to hinder his real influence. Rather than have those days return, it were better that the minister should stand wholly upon his merits, and that he should have no influence but that which his personal character and his faithfulness in preaching the word of God might give him.

All this is true, and yet I fear our people have gone too far to the other extreme — I mean the extreme of holding that there is no sacredness attaching to the office of Christ's minister, and no divine calling except that which consists in gifts. In our revulsion from the theory of apostolic succession and from the error of supposing grace to be transmitted through human fingers, some have gone to the opposite extreme of denying that any grace is bestowed by God. In short, there is a theory of the minister's vocation which would deprive the word "vocation" of all its proper meaning. Instead of being a calling, the ministry is regarded as a mere pursuit or profession, like any other pursuit or profession in which men employ themselves. The only calling is gifts, and these gifts are self-given. The minister ceases to be an ambassador of God, separated from his birth unto the gospel of God, endowed with special helps, and clothed with special authority from God.

See how this change of view affects young men as they contemplate the ministry. All sense of the honor of God's calling, and the solemnity of a relation to God so intimate as that of his spokesman and representative, ceases at once. That great attraction of the ministry, which has led many a lofty-minded young man to prefer its labors and trials to all earthly pleasure and fame and power, is gone forever, so soon as we ignore the fact of a divine call to assume its responsibilities. Only then, when we regard it as a vocation to which God points the soul by his providence and Spirit, does obedience to his will become blessed, and resistance to his will, dreadful. To me, this increasing unbelief in a divine call to the ministry seems one of the most serious signs of the times. When God calls a man, there we may be sure that natural gifts will not be absent; but I protest that, though a man might have the natural gifts of a Fénélon or of a Paul, we have no right to ordain him, and he has no right to seek ordination, unless beyond and above this possession of natural gifts, the secret conviction has been in some way wrought into his heart that he is called of God to the ministry, and he can say: "Woe is me, if I preach not the gospel?" This belief that the minister of Christ is divinely called to his work, we need to restore to its true place in the minds of the young men of our colleges and of our churches. Only when they appreciate the sublime dignity of God's calling, will they feel that "he that desireth the office of bishop desireth a good work," and that this work is one so surpassing all earthly vocations that they may well desire it for themselves.

I have left but a brief space to indicate certain possible remedies for this sad disposition on the part of our young men of talent and culture to desert the ministry of the gospel. Let this part of my paper take the form of application, first to the ministers, and secondly to the laymen of our churches. It lies in the power of the ministry itself to increase the number of ministers, by simply making the ministry attractive. There is a querulous spirit discernible here and there among our ministers, a jealous, envying spirit, a discontented and ambitious spirit, which has its root in unbelieving forgetfulness of God's promises, and a dimmed apprehension of God's truth. I have heard good men lament, in a way that no struggling lawyer or physician would ever indulge in, their inadequate support, and the small respect that was paid them. But the only way to get respect is to be respectable, and the trials of the ministry are far more easily borne when a manly spirit

is summoned up to bear them. I have heard ministers complain that they were compelled to hawk themselves about, as slaves at Southern auction-blocks used to cry to this dealer and to that: "Buy me! buy me!" But I have heard also of a certain slave in ancient Greece, who, under similar circumstances, when asked what his strong points were, said proudly, "I can rule men; whoso wants a master, let him buy me!" In the early centuries, Christians sold themselves into slavery, in order that they might obtain access for the gospel to the houses of noble masters, and so bring these very masters into submission to Christ. Let the Christian minister so reverence his calling, that the selling of himself to a church shall seem a small price to pay for this mastery of men!

But above and beyond this high estimate of his vocation, there needs earnest endeavor to walk worthily of it. Men are to be reached by living thought — thought that will waken the intellect and stir the heart. The minister must be a thinking being. He must substitute thought for commonplace. Nothing will so divest the ministry of its attractiveness to young men as cant in the pulpit, or the indolent retailing of the thoughts of other men. If the preacher does his own thinking, he will be apt to be independent in the expression of his thought. He will be no sycophant to public opinion. And yet his freedom will be freedom in the truth; not individual dogmatism, but continual reference to the authority of Scripture, and the backing up of what is urged as truth by a "Thus saith the Lord,"— this is the freedom that gives the preacher power. Such freedom as this will be accompanied by humility of spirit. The messenger will be hidden behind his message. His fervor will not be the self-moved enthusiasm of high animal spirits and merely natural sympathy; it will be that penetrating and irresistible earnestness which the unction and power of the Holy Spirit alone can give. Under God, our ministry have the recruiting of their ranks in their own hands. When they are commanded to commit the gospel to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also, they can with God's help fulfill the commission. And they can do it, by making full proof of their own ministry. Let them be filled with the Spirit and give themselves wholly to their work, and no king upon his throne can wield such influence or win so high regard. Under the hands of such a preacher, young men will come to take his view of the ministry, and will count it their highest honor to enter it.

But my second application of this subject is to laymen. The rank and file of the churches have duties in this matter also. They must call forth the ministers of the coming generation. God's call no more renders unnecessary man's call here, than God's regenerating agency renders human agency unnecessary in bringing sinners into the kingdom. In the first centuries the churches used to feel their duty in this regard, and when pastors were needed, they used to lay the burden of preaching the gospel upon young men of proper native endowments, even when these young men were themselves reluctant to accept the charge. When they fled in order to escape, the churches sent their messengers after them, brought them back, and as it were, compelled them to serve in the ministry. The one great ancient church-orator, Chrysostom, the golden-mouthed, was chosen thus. And in our own day and in our own denomination, Dr. William R. Williams,

that prince of preachers, was called after a similar fashion, his church summarily electing him its pastor, when he was in full practice of the law. We must do more than we now do to make our young men feel their responsibility in this regard. We must convince them that the burden of proof rests upon them; what good reason can they give why they should not serve Christ as preachers of his gospel? The putting of this question would oftener than we think reveal the fact that God had already gone before us, and had been stirring the young man's mind, if not with yearnings, at least with apprehensions, that in that direction his duty might lie.

But the layman's responsibility does not cease with the exertion of his personal influence to induce the brightest young men of the churches to enter the ministry; he must also do his part to provide them with proper training for their work. One of the great duties of the laity of the present day is to demand proper qualifications of mental discipline and sound doctrine in those who are to be their teachers. And since the majority of young men cannot make these qualifications their own without long courses of study, it is the additional duty of the laity to see that the means for pursuing these studies are provided. While the standard of preparation is so high, young men cannot, without danger to health and without injury to their scholastic work, support themselves during this preliminary training by the labor of their own brains or hands. When they give up all hope of secular advancement in order to prepare themselves for the ministry, it is only fit that they should be maintained by the churches they expect to serve. Their time is precious,— the churches must economize it, and get them into their work at the earliest possible day. And then comes in the need of institutions where they may be trained under Christian teachers — institutions academical, collegiate, and theological — institutions thoroughly endowed, equipped, manned, and supported. As, in prospect of a famine, Joseph laid up in storehouses the provision for future years, so the churches must provide against a threatened famine of the word of God, by treasuring up the means and instruments of Christian education.

Men and institutions,— brethren of the laity, we look to you for these! But we look to you for something more vitally important still. I mean for that personal faith and prayer which alone can change the tone and spirit of our times, and cause the hearts of our best and noblest youth to turn, as by an irresistible gravitation, to the ministry of the gospel. Our Lord has bidden us pray for laborers. I fear that prayer has been disused of late. While we do our part in urging upon young men the solemnity of the obligation that rests upon them to decide their duty in this matter in the sight of God, let us feel our dependence upon him in whose hand are all the hearts of men, and who turneth them, as the little rivulets of the eastern fields are turned, by the slightest motion of the hand or the foot of the husbandman. The permanent and sufficient remedy for all our needs and dangers is to be found only in a turning of the heart of the church to God, and a turning of the heart of our youth by God. May these insufficient words of mine help us to appreciate the vast importance of the work that is thus laid upon us,— and to this work, as Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg, "let us dedicate ourselves."

XXV.

THE LACK OF STUDENTS FOR THE MINISTRY.*

Not long since, I received a letter from a young man who graduated from our Seminary only three years ago, saying that within the past year six different churches, all of them strong and large, had made him pressing overtures, urging him to leave his present place and to become their pastor. And yet, on the same day that I received this letter, a prominent layman in one of our country churches told me that when *his* pastor recently resigned, the church received a flood of letters from ministers in all parts of the State, offering themselves as candidates for the vacant pastorate. I beg you put these facts together. Ministers enough and to spare, of a certain sort — uneducated men, men who cannot preach, men who cannot stay more than a year or two in a place — but such a lack of trained and competent men, that the strong churches find pastors only by robbing one another, and a famine of the word of God impends unless this lack of ministers is supplied.

What are the figures? Simply these: In 1832, fifty years ago, there were in the United States 3,600 Baptist ministers to 5,300 churches, or 1,700 more churches than ministers. In 1882, there were 16,000 ministers to 26,000 churches, or 10,000 more churches than ministers, while the proportion of ministers to church members had declined 25 per cent, During the last ten years there have been reported in our year-books 4,500 ordinations to the ministry; during those same ten years our Theological Seminaries have graduated not more than 1,000 men, so that not one quarter of those who have entered the ministry have had a full course of training. Our population has been largely increasing, yet in sixteen Northern Baptist Colleges we had in 1882 only 1,582 students, as compared with 1,694 in the year 1872 — that is, a loss of seven per cent. in the last ten years. In 1872, there were in these colleges 408 students for the ministry; last year there were only 294,— that is, a loss within ten years of 28 per cent. Within fifty years the proportion of college graduates entering the ministry of all evangelical denominations has dropped from 46 to 17 per cent, while in two of our principal Baptist colleges it has declined from 42 to 20 per cent. Twelve years ago, or as early as 1871, a writer in the Bibliotheca Sacra called attention to the decreasing number of trained men entering the ministry. But the evil is far greater to-day than it was twelve years ago. The sum and substance of it is that young men of culture and promise are ceasing to enter the ministry, and that while our church membership has increased several fold, the supply of educated ministers has greatly diminished, and is still continuing to diminish.

* An address delivered at the meeting of the New York Baptist State Convention, Buffalo, October 25, 1883.

The result is that a multitude of weak men and of half-trained men are pressing into the ministry. We are not getting as good material in our Seminaries as we got twenty years ago. Men come to us without college training; or, if they come from the colleges, they are not in general the strongest men. We have some men — a few — as good as we have ever had, but these are the exceptions. We can take only what is given us, and neither the churches nor the colleges are giving us as many men, nor as able men, as they once did. Yet the demand for men even of imperfect training is so great that the student is tempted by the offers of some admiring church to cut short his brief period of study, and to enter the ministry before he half knows what he is to preach. Our strong churches find it very hard to secure fit pastors; they spend months and sometimes even years of their history in search of them; when they do secure one who pleases their fancy, they often learn too late that his resources fit him only for temporary success; they are not long content with his imperfect work, and they soon seek a new pastor; and amid all this weakness and change the hold of the church upon the thoughtful and active minds in the community is lost, and after ten or twenty years facts show that the church has gone backward, both in numbers and in influence.

We want pastors of mental grasp and thorough culture, to instruct and lead our stronger churches. Where shall we look for them? To the Seminaries? But the Seminaries — where shall *they* find them? In the colleges? But who will furnish them to the colleges? You would naturally answer: Just such churches as need their services. In other words, if the strong churches need able and cultivated pastors, the strong churches ought to furnish the ministry with recruits of this sort from their own number; from their own families, at least the raw material for ministers should come. Does it come from such churches? I answer: Hardly to an appreciable extent. Almost all the students of our Seminaries come from the small country churches, and from the families of the poor. I belong to the First Baptist Church of Rochester. The church lives under the shadow of the University and the Theological Seminary. I asked one of our deacons the other day how many young men had entered the ministry during the last forty years from the families of our First Baptist Church. "Well," said he, "there is you." "Yes," I said, "and who else is there?" And he could mention no other. I love the church to which I belong, and I speak of it only because I believe it an illustration and sample of many others — of almost all our large and well to do churches throughout the State and the land. But I ask: Is it right for these large churches to be always taking and never giving — depending upon others to give them their ministers, but furnishing no ministers themselves? Is not something wrong, when a strong church does nothing toward filling up the ranks of the ministry? If it has a half dozen ministers in forty years, ought it not to raise up from its own number at least another half dozen ministers, to supply the wants of other fields?

Where is the difficulty? What is the cause of the trouble? It is simply this: We have forgotten that we have anything to do with respect to the reinforcement of the ministry. We have said to ourselves: The law of supply and demand will take care of that. We have forgotten that the law of

supply and demand has its foundation in the purely selfish interests of men, and that without the working of God's Spirit upon human hearts, the greater the need of an unselfish ministry, the smaller will be the supply. Or we have said to ourselves : God will take care of this matter,—when he wants a minister he will call him. Yes, and when he wants a man to be a Christian he will call him. But it will not be without your help. You must go to that man and plead with him, if you ever expect him to be saved. So it is not enough for us to preach the gospel ourselves. We are bound to "commit it to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Nothing good in this fallen world will take care of itself. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. So the church is divine; but its doctrines, its ordinances, its offices, its privileges, are given to us to defend and maintain. When we withdraw our hand and leave any of these interests to chance, then God's cause will go down.

We have forgotten both our own personal duty and our dependence upon God. There is the plain command of Christ, to pray the Lord of the harvest that he send laborers into his harvest. How frequently have you heard that prayer in public worship during the past twenty years? How frequently have you poured out your soul in private for the same blessing? Is the day of prayer for colleges observed in your church? Do mothers and fathers pray God that their sons may be ministers? I have been reading of Hannah, and of the answer to her prayer in the birth of Samuel, the child whose very name meant "asked of God." Hannah's song of inspired praise and her sacrifice of her son to God, when he was her only one, prove to me that it was God's cause for which she prayed, and not simply that her own reproach might be taken away. Israel had reached a low state, when the very high priest of the nation had complicity with iniquity. Hannah prayed for the turning back of this tide of sin, and for the establishment of the kingdom of God; and her prayer was answered in the birth of no common child, and in his doing of no common work for God,—for Samuel was the first of the prophets, and the setter-up of the kingdom in Israel.

How many mothers and fathers are praying now that out of the number of their children God will raise up one, large in mind and heart, sanctified from his birth, filled with the Spirit of God, that he may stand between the living and the dead, be the mouth-piece of the Almighty, proclaim Christ and his unsearchable riches, lead the perishing to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world? How many are willing to let strangers care for them in their old age, if their sons may be only preaching the everlasting gospel? How many, when they think of their children's future, look beyond the meat that perisheth, and wish most of all that their sons may feed upon the word of God, and may impart it to others, as Christ broke the five loaves to the hungry multitude? Ah, thank God, there are some! Dr. Robinson, of New York, tells us of a mother whose long continued prayer brought no answer, though her son had graduated from college, and had begun to teach. But at last he was converted, and with his conversion came the desire and purpose to preach the gospel. He came fifty miles to bring his mother word. Then for the first time she told him how, in sending a missionary-box to the heathen, when he was a child, she had enclosed one of his little garments, and with it had sent a note begging the mission-

ary to join his prayers to hers, and never to cease until the child that had worn that little garment was made a disciple of Christ, and a minister of his gospel.

Some such mothers there are, but are there many such? Do we long to have our sons ministers of Christ, with all the trials incident to that vocation, or do we wish them to be successful merchants, lawyers, journalists, physicians? Ah, I look upon the families of our well-to-do and educated men, and I see almost no sons of theirs entering the ministry. I look upon the graduating classes of our colleges, and I see only the weak, the lame, the halt, the blind, willing to lay themselves upon God's altar. I look upon our largest city churches, and I find it the rarest exception if one of them gives a candidate to the ministry. We want the best gifts, the best training, the best social culture in the ministry. We look for such most naturally to these families, these colleges, these churches. But we find Christian parents urging their sons *not* to preach, rather than encouraging them to it; college presidents glorifying other professions at the expense of the ministry, till it seems to their students a mean thing to preach the gospel; Christian churches looking everywhere else for ministers but to the young men of their own number.

I have heard it said that this is all due to the lack of heroic spirit in our age, and West Point has been referred to as an example. There, as I am informed, the quality of the students has greatly deteriorated since ten, fifteen, twenty years ago. Other professions hold out greater prizes than the profession of arms. Engineering and art, chemistry and the service of great corporations, offer far quicker promotion and greater salaries than can be found in army life. And some would have us believe that it is so in the ministry. Young men cannot make enough, in preaching Christ, and so they will not preach. I am unwilling to believe it of the young men of our time. I do not believe that they are all 'dudes', devoid of all generous ambition, worshipers only of the almighty dollar. No, I remember how war stirred our pulses once, and how the need of sacrifices for the country brought thousands of brave men into the field, ready to fight, and if need be, to die. I believe it is the inertness and uselessness of military life in time of peace that keep the best men from West Point to-day,—and I believe that, if the young men of our churches could only hear the trumpet-call to heroic service in the ministry, they would flock to the standard, ready for any labor and any sacrifice.

Why do not young men feel thus? Because they are not better than the churches around them. Because the churches themselves do not properly estimate the dignity and the need of the ministry. They have forgotten that the minister is directly called by God, intrusted with God's words, endowed with God's spirit. Fathers and mothers have forgotten that "he who desires the office of a bishop desires a good thing;" that it is an infinite honor to any son of theirs to be called to that high office; that there is a satisfaction in being used to bring men from eternal death to eternal life, that passes all the satisfaction of this world; and that to give up all for Christ and his kingdom is to gain all for time and eternity. Ah, we should pray, if we reverenced the ministerial office; and we should reverence the ministerial office, if we simply believed God's word with regard to the lost

condition of man, Christ's infinite sacrifice to save him, and the everlasting import of the decisions of time. And here is my greatest source of anxiety. I fear that this lack of interest in the supply of the ministry is due to the inroads of a subtle unbelief that substitutes formalism for religion, and dependence upon man for dependence upon God. God forbid that we should first lose our reverence for the ministry, as an office of God's appointment, and then also lose the ministry itself, which we have thought a thing of so small account!

It is our business to ring the alarm-bell and to sound out the trumpet-call. As pastors, we need to direct the attention of our churches to this great matter, and to give them no rest till they feel their duty and discharge it. As church members, we need to pray and work to diffuse a new sentiment throughout our whole Baptist body. As Baptists, who claim to believe the whole word of God, we need to set ourselves to turn the tide and create an enthusiasm for the ministry among our young men. And as a Convention of Baptist Churches, met to consider the signs of the times and the needs of the cause, what could we better do than to pass with solemn unanimity the recommendation of this Report, that all Baptist pastors throughout this State be urged to preach upon this subject to their people, and that all Baptist churches throughout the State be invited to set apart the Thursday of the Week of Prayer for special intercession to God, that he will stir up the minds of the best young men of our churches to give themselves to the gospel ministry. A year ago our brethren of the German Baptist churches took this same action for themselves, and this fall we saw the result in the quadrupling of the number of our new German students at Rochester. My brethren, we have sinned; we have disobeyed Christ's command. We are suffering, and must yet suffer, under his discipline. But we trust that it has not been wilful disobedience, but a sin of forgetfulness and infirmity. There is pardon for us, and the turning of our captivity, when we repent and pray. May God give us the mighty Spirit of grace and supplication, that as one man the churches of this State, and every member of them, may "pray the Lord of the harvest, that he will send laborers into his harvest."

XXVI.

EDUCATION FOR THE MINISTRY:

ITS PRINCIPLES AND ITS NECESSITY.*

Brethren of the Monroe Association :—I thank you for this invitation to address you. I take it as a welcome home, to one who has been long away. Among you I was born, and not very far from here was the place of my spiritual birth also. It seems fit that I should come back at last, and do what I can to repay the debt I owe. I am sure that in doing the work of theological education among you, I am serving you. The history of this association, and its growth in intelligence and spiritual power, bear witness to the value of trained men in the ministry. But the very blessing of God upon the work already done only urges us forward to larger work in the future. I do not know how you may feel here, but in my Ohio pastorate I was constantly oppressed with the spectacle of the destitute fields about me, and the scarcity of men who were able and willing to fill them. With the great growth of the country, and the diminished inclination of young men among us to resign the hope of business advancement for the prospect of a long course of study for the ministry, it seems to me a time when every church and every Christian needs most seriously to ponder this great need of laborers to fill the places of those who are passing away, and to occupy the vast fields now opening on every side of us. We have been told to pray that God will raise up ministers. We must remember that we cannot truly pray, without at the same time seeking out and educating men for the ministry of the gospel. We shall do this, just in proportion as we appreciate the fundamental principles upon which this duty rests. These principles may be stated in some such way as this : First, God has appointed the ministry as a chief and indispensible agency for the perfecting of his church and for the conversion of the world. Secondly, the ministry, to be most efficient and successful, must be specially trained for its work. Thirdly, it is the duty of the churches to seek out men of natural fitness, lay upon them the duty of preaching, and when they are moved to give themselves to the work, furnish them with all needful means of preparation for their calling.

About the first point, not one of us has a doubt. We believe in the divine appointment of the ministry — the setting apart of a class of men for the specific work of perfecting the church and propagating the gospel. All Christians indeed are responsible to Christ for a similar work. But Christ's ministers are to be leaders of the rest. No other agency can take the place of theirs. No power of civilization or of the press or of the sword can ever

* An address delivered at the annual meeting of the Monroe Baptist Association, West Henrietta, October 2, 1872.

accomplish those moral wonders which are brought about, when a man clothed with God's power stands up and pleads with beating heart and living voice that men will be reconciled to God. In the great political contest which now agitates the nation, neither party dare content itself with newspaper articles and private influence alone. Men must be gathered in masses, and confronted with other men who sway them by personal magnetism as well as by argument. And so the influence of the pulpit will endure so long as the world endures. There is provision and demand for it in the constitution of the human mind. Just as physicians exist because man has a physical nature, and lawyers exist because man has civil relations, so ministers of religion exist because there is such a thing as a social and religious nature in man.

Consider the second point, then. The ministry, to be most efficient and successful, must be specially educated for its work. I might speak to you of the general advantages of education. I might tell you of the demand for trained men in all the arts. Only the other day one of the most successful manufacturers in Philadelphia said that it had been found, among manufacturing engineers, that establishments and firms that employed educated men for managers, succeeded, while those which employed men not educated, did not. I might tell you of the rising sentiment all through the land which demands that all who enter responsible positions in our diplomatic and civil as well as our military service shall be men specially educated and qualified for their work. Now if this principle holds in the management of locomotive-shops, and in the military and civil service of the nation, must it not hold much more in the church, that great arsenal of spiritual powers? If we require the men who doctor our bodies to pass through special courses of study before entering upon their work, shall we not require it of physicians of the soul? If we provide normal schools for those who teach our children the rudiments of earthly knowledge, shall we not give equal facilities of preparation to those who are to instruct us out of the word of God?

Just here we touch the vital point. Ministers of the gospel are ordained for the special work of instructing and influencing mind. The priests of the old dispensation were set for a different work. They were the servants of an external system of rites and forms. Paul most sharply describes the leading characteristics of the two, by calling the priests of the Mosaic economy "they that minister at the altar," while he styles the ministers of the New Testament "they that preach the gospel." The Old Testament priests were representatives of the worshiper and, as it were, performed his service for him. The New Testament minister never supersedes his brethren, but only teaches them to perform true service for themselves. The New Testament minister, I say, is set to instruct and influence mind. But by what means? By bringing to bear upon that mind the truth of God. The office of the ministry is to enlarge men's views of truth and deepen their love for it, and then, with this solid basis of intelligent conviction, to organize and develope their practical activities in serving the Master and converting the world. And, therefore, having a work to do which is not mechanical or simply emotional in its nature, but which consists in bringing truth to bear upon men's minds and conduct, it is evident that the ministers of the gospel must be men who not only know the truth, but who know how to wield the truth

so as to convince others. To know this truth of God as God has written it, know it in its connections and relations, know it in the grandeur of its system and unity, know it in its wonderful adaptation to all the wants of the human soul—this requires not only the highest natural powers, but the best training of those powers which both man and God can give.

But the day has gone by for this general argument. We all understand it. None of us are in danger of supposing that Paul did not need his early training in the schools, because Christ appeared to him near Damascus; or that the apostles did not need their three years' theological course under the Savior's teaching, because they were to receive the Holy Ghost afterwards; or that God's call obviates the necessity of study and preparation on the part of his preachers now. Let us take all that for granted, and let me give you some special reasons in the nature of our times, why a higher education is demanded in our ministry than has ever been given before. One reason may be found in the advancing intelligence of the age. The newspaper and the common school have revolutionized society. The young of this generation participate in a general culture which has been unknown to the masses in any age before. Our children know more of general literature and of political science at the age of ten, than their great-grandfathers knew at the age of twenty. They are critical hearers now. If the ministry is to influence them, it must be abreast of them in intellectual progress. Nay, is it not true that, to master this youthful mind of the century, the ministry must be before it in point of mental attainment? The best economy for the farmer who thinks twenty dollars a year a large contribution for the support of his minister, is to make that twenty a hundred, and so secure a pastor who can have power over his children's minds. If he contents himself with the cheapest service he can get, he may think himself well off if his boy's waywardness does not make every twenty dollars cost him in the end a thousand, besides the sorrow of his old age and the ruin of the child. And not simply for those who are to constitute the strength or weakness of the next generation. For the present adult mass of our congregations, we need the best gifts and training that can be furnished. We hear much about the power of the old-fashioned ministry of a hundred years ago, and I thank God for all they wrought. But it is not less true that if they lived to-day, they would preach sermons of different model from those they preached then, —or even Jonathan Edwards would lose his hearers. May God give us all the fervor and self-sacrifice they showed, and above all, the power of the Spirit that rested upon them. But with all these, which we may have as well as they, let us seek to know the truest and most effective method of reaching the modern mind, for we have to deal not with the eighteenth but the nineteenth century,—and we are to bring out of the treasures of God things new as well as old. God calls upon us to lead this advanced intelligence of the age with a still more advanced intelligence in the ministry of the church of Christ.

A second reason in our times for the most advanced culture in the ministry may be found in the skeptical tendencies of the day. "This is an age of unsolved problems," a modern German writer says most truly. The world asks religious teachers for the solution of them. There never was a day when the higher forms of speculative doubt had influence over so wide

a range of mind. As the world has come up in intelligence, it has come out from sensual opposition to intellectual opposition to Christianity. Brutal skepticism like that of Tom Paine and Voltaire has had its day. We live in an age when the name of religion is used to conjure with, and all the devil's most specious lies are labelled "Christianity." It is an age of scientific marvels, and of arguments against all real Christianity, drawn from science. But this science of the day is mostly the science of matter and of the things of matter. A subtle doubt whether there be any science of mind, whether there be any such thing as spirit, pervades a large part of our literature, It lurks in the most cultivated minds of our congregations, and often operates as an antidote to our most pointed arguments. A thousand forms of heart-unbelief entrench themselves in false theories and false philosophies, and could not long maintain themselves without these defenses. How plain it is that the preacher of the day should be prepared to treat such unbelief intelligently, unmask the fallacies of its reasoning, and then set the mind upon the sure foundation of truth. Or if, as is often the case, the errors of those we address rest upon some false historical foundation, there is great need of such knowledge of doctrines and practices in their past development as will enable the preacher to show from what small deviations in principle the most enormous and soul-destroying errors have grown. Forewarned, forearmed, says the old proverb. Let our rising ministry have the means of knowing beforehand the nature of the opposition which they have to encounter in their work.

Then there is a demand for special discipline of mind in the preacher, arising from the intensity of modern life. We live faster than any age before us. Railroads and telegraphs have compressed into days the work of years. We do not live as long as Methusaleh did, but we live just as much. We have learned to think quickly and act quickly. There is a wonderful rush and excitement about modern trade and modern amusements. Men come into our churches and prayer circles jaded, and yet excited, with the press of the day's or the week's business. If you would influence them at all, you must think faster than they — furnish an excitement that will supersede theirs — startle them into attention, rouse them to thought, press them to immediate action, lest they go out into the whirl, and the tide sweep them away again. They will not stand the sermons four hours long, that were preached in the days of the Puritans and the Long Parliament. What truth they take in must be pemmican and not broth, condensed and hot, or they will certainly loathe the light bread the pulpit gives them. We have models in Scripture of short sermons and short prayers in abundance,— I do not know that we have more than one instance of long preaching, and that seems to have killed one of the hearers. But, whether intended as models or not, these Scripture instances are the only examples to follow in our age. And to preach the truth to this generation, stirring with life as it is, demands a power of concentration and a discipline of mind in the minister, that can be gained only by diligent and protracted study.— And the necessity of all this is the greater, from the fact that the preacher of the gospel in these days must be several men in one. The old recluse life of the monastery is out of place now. He must be a public man, a citizen as well as a preacher, a man interested in the denomination and the church at large, as well as

devoted to his own parish. These demands he cannot well meet without a power of quick and vigorous analysis, a habit of systematic labor, a careful economy of time, a mind that can turn in a moment from talk to study, or from study to prayer. If this discipline has not been gained in early life, it is hard to secure it afterwards. The joints of the mind are most supple in youth,—men run most easily then into the mould of habit. To meet this intense age on its own ground, and turn its activities into holy channels, needs early preparation of both mind and heart. The best preachers feel their needs in this respect the most, and wonder that God can use such inapt material for any good. Let us see that the next generation of preachers enters on its work with better equipment than we possess.

A better preparation is demanded again by the fact that this is an age of organization. The forces of evil are organized as never before. Every new enterprise of speculation or trade has its Society. So, too, it is an age of organized religious effort. Our churches in the great cities are seeing the necessity of a division of labor among their members, and of providing agencies for developing the various gifts of the church, and of encouraging and sustaining all manner of benevolent undertakings. It is beginning to be seen that a true pastor is more than a preacher, more than a visitor of his flock, more than a worker on individuals,—that he is not only to work himself but to do a large part of his work through others,—in other words, that he is to combine and organize the talent of the church and to lead it out to new work and new conquests for Christ. If Alexander the Great should wake from his slumbers, he could not fight the battle of Sedan to-day without learning the art of war. And the pastor of a century ago, who should wake from sleep to-day in the midst of a working church in London or New York or Rochester, and should see the order and efficiency of Sabbath school and mission work, of church visitation, of poor relief societies, of temperance organizations, of committees on strangers, of street preaching enterprises, would not only think the millennium near at hand, but would ask to be taught this new art of war that he too might be successful. In this day when we are learning so much of the value of organization in Christ's work, how plain it is that we ought not to send out our young ministers without giving them the opportunity of observing and participating in these new plans and agencies for the extension of Christ's kingdom. I thank God that our Theological Seminary is planted in a large city, under the shadow of four large and vigorous churches, in which our students in course of preparation for the ministry may see with their own eyes and hear with their own ears what Christ is doing in these modern days to develop and enlarge the activities of his church. I count the pastors of these churches as assistant professors in the seminary, and these churches as our great support and strength. Let all our rising ministry have the opportunity of learning from them, and then go to their several charges over the land prepared to put over the doorways of their churches that inscription which one sees over the entrance to the Pacific Mills : "And to every man, his work."

But after all, the great need of this age is the need of consecrated men, men filled with the Spirit of God. It is an age of advancing intelligence, of intense life, of skeptical tendencies, of organized effort of every kind,—but it is also an age of absorption in outward things. Meditation, introspection,

hardly exist. Nothing can make head against the current of wordliness but the fervor, the unction, the power, that come from God. I urge you, therefore, brethren, to put your rising ministers under influences which will impress upon them the necessity of a hidden life with God and a profound communion with his truth. Paul did not rush at once into the great labors of his life,—he spent three years in Arabia. And I believe that in the life of the Theological Seminary have been nurtured some of the noblest characters, have been born some of the noblest enterprises, that have ever adorned the annals of the church. It was while a student in Williams College, that Samuel J. Mills invited his college-mates Hall and Richards to a walk and led them to a retired spot in a meadow, where they spent all day in fasting and prayer, and in conversing on the duty of missions to the heathen. And so in the Theological Seminary it was, that Adoniram Judson and Samuel Newell came to the resolution of spending their lives in pagan lands, and the result of that Seminary work was the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. In the three years of this Seminary life, and its warm-hearted communion with other students about the needs of the world and the power of Christ, our young men have an opportunity of spiritual growth and preparation, whose value is inestimable. And this Association can testify that, with the inward growth, there has often been outward work, in destitute regions about, that proved the value of the preparation, and gave promise of great future harvests to be reaped for God.

And this brings me to the third and last thought of my subject,— namely, the obligation that rests upon the churches, not only to seek out and encourage the men whom God has called to the work of the ministry, but to provide the means needful for their training and support until they shall be ready for their active work. I fear that in all these particulars we are sadly deficient. I fear that the old days when Christian men and women consecrated their sons to the ministry of Christ from the cradle are almost gone by, and that we have fallen upon times when the calling of a preacher is thought rather beneath the aspirations of the cultivated and well-born. We need to have a revival of true sentiments in this matter, for depreciation of Christ's ambassadors is depreciation of Christ himself. When we consider whose ambassadors they are, and what business they transact between the King of kings and his subjects, what earthly dignity seems so high as theirs? Surely an office like this demands the choicest and noblest gifts. As Archbishop Leighton has said: "If bodily integrity was necessary to those who ministered of old at the altar, shall the mentally blind and lame be good enough for the ministration of that gospel that exceeds in glory? Let us not imitate Jeroboam, who made high places but made priests of the lowest of the people, who had abundance of golden cups but was content with wooden priests." If the minister of the gospel be, as George Herbert says, "the deputy of Christ for the reducing of men to the obedience of God," then no talents or graces can be too precious to be employed in this sacred service. Why is it then that we lack for men,— why do scores of most important posts call for able ministers of Christ, and call in vain? Is it not because the churches at large have not felt the great necessity? And as church after church rises in culture to the point where the unanimous voice

is: "Let us have an educated minister, to educate our children and the community," who can tell where the supplies will be for our failing ranks ten years from now, unless God grant us a new spirit of prayer and effort for the raising up of a competent ministry? If there ever was a time when we needed to ponder our Savior's command to pray for laborers, it is now.

It has been said that the great error of Luther was that, while he restored New Testament doctrine, he did not restore the New Testament church; that, while he cared for the faith, he did not care for the organization of believers upon the model left by Christ. I have another fault to find with Luther, which seems to me almost if not quite as serious, namely, that he did not establish Seminaries for the education of the ministry. Contending, like a giant, against the influence of Aristotle, that "accursed mischief-making heathen" as he called him, he notwithstanding left the Universities under that same influence, and the Universities trained up men to undo all his work. See the result in Germany. When once the spiritual impulse of Luther's personal presence had ceased, the enemy began to gather strength. Uninstructed piety did not stand against the assaults of rationalism. With the Universities training men of thought to do battle against the faith, and no distinctively Christian schools to train its defenders, the result was that, two centuries after, infidelity was to all intents and purposes the established religion of Germany, and half the fruits of the Reformation were swept away. Our German Baptists of the old country are in danger of repeating the same error. With much gained under the labors of Dr. Oncken, there is little or no provision for the leadership and instruction of the churches after Dr. Oncken has passed away. It is only just now that they are waking up to see that, without Seminaries for the training of ministers, all that has been gained is in peril, and that a few years may see the rushing tide of irreligion sweeping over them again. We cannot consolidate what we have gained in a new convert, without instruction and discipline. How much less can we consolidate the results of a great popular awakening over a whole country, without provision for the instruction and discipline of the formed and forming churches. Let us appreciate our own position as a denomination, brethren! Under the good Providence of God, we have come up from weakness to be the second denomination, in point of numbers, in the land. We have secured the ear of the world. Every step in the progress of Biblical scholarship has been a step forward for us. With our very denominational existence based upon knowledge of the original languages of the Bible and a correct interpretation of it, we stand or fall with the education of our ministry. And now the question rises before us, solemn and momentous as no other can be, shall we fix and consolidate what we have gained, or shall we allow it all, through ignorance and neglect, to be swept away? I know your answer, brethren. You say, let us set ourselves to this great work until every village and town and hamlet throughout the land shall be provided with a teacher and pastor who shall expound the word of God,—and, in accordance with the model there laid down, shall build up the beautiful structure of a New Testament church — a church of baptized believers.

And what are the means? Our Theological Seminaries come first and foremost. What have they not done for us? Dr. Hackett, our venerated professor, was telling me only the other day of the time when he and a few

other students were counting up the number of educated Baptist ministers in the neighborhood of Boston, and they could find but three,—now at every Anniversary of Newton Theological Institution, they come up by scores and even hundreds. Seminaries like Newton and Rochester have already trained the very best pastors and preachers we have — the very strength of our denomination to-day. It is our duty to see that the Theological Seminary nearest to us, and upon which we most naturally depend, shall never want for buildings, library, teachers, — never want for facilities of every sort for the work it has to do. Is there one within the sound of my voice who has been blessed by God with abundant financial prosperity? Let me beg such an one to consider the power for good of a blow struck at the right time. Who can tell the ultimate good accomplished by that single man Crozer, in the establishment of the Seminary for theological education near Philadelphia? Untold ages will rise up to call him blesssed, and the fruits of his benefactions will go on ripening and gathering until the great harvest-day of the world! May God raise up many such men to bless the church and the world! We may not be able to give as largely, but we may all do our part, if we only have the like spirit. There are many even now pressing their way bravely through a Seminary course, though it costs them sacrifice and hardship. We must not let such men waste years of strength in manual toil, before they come to us, in order to make money enough to pay their way through the Seminary. We must not let them want for books and clothes after they have come. We must take them into our sympathies and prayers, and furnish them with all that is needed to make their course of study profitable and successful. And this cannot be done for a large number of students, without large outlay and expenditure. But to this all of us may contribute, and in doing it may feel that we give directly to Christ and the work of his gospel. We may all at least assist in the work of the New York Baptist Union for Ministerial Education, and thereby help on to a place in the ministry some useful man who, when we are dead, may be proclaiming the everlasting gospel. Take this Society into your hearts then, my brethren. Give liberally into its treasury. Send to it the men whom God has called, and whom it should educate. And "may he that ministereth seed to the sower, both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness, being enriched in everything to all bountifulness, which causeth through us thanksgiving to God."

XXVII.

EDUCATION FOR THE MINISTRY:

ITS IDEA AND ITS REQUISITES.*

We are assembled this afternoon to dedicate this edifice to God and to the cause of ministerial education. The enlightened liberality of a friend who honors us with his presence on this occasion, and whose name the building will bear through coming years, puts the completed structure in our possession, to be used henceforth, so long as the timber and the stones shall hold together, for the one purpose of providing a proper training for those who are to be the preachers of the gospel of Christ. It is matter of profound satisfaction to know that this gift, so munificent and free, has been made in prayer, as an offering not to men but to Jesus our Lord. May the Spirit of Jesus abundantly rest upon the giver, and make his gift to us a source of the best gifts to him! And may the Spirit of Jesus also rest upon us, that we may be made worthy of the gift, and be properly qualified to use it for the honor of Christ and for the advancement of sacred learning!

We rejoice to-day, because we see in this dedication a sign of progress. The members of this Board of Trustees, who have so many times during the last thirty years assumed so serious financial responsibilities, rejoice that God has raised up able friends for the Seminary. And if those early projectors and helpers of this enterprise who were called to their reward before their eyes could see the fulfillment of their hopes — if those early friends who founded the institution in tears and prayers, can look down upon this scene, I am sure that they rejoice with us — the sowers with the reapers. God has heard and answered prayer on behalf of his cause; he has established the work of our hands; to him alone be praise!

The Germans have a beautiful word derived from the traveler's custom of getting his bearings before he starts anew upon his journey. They say that he "orients himself" — turns to the east with its sun and light, that he may know how to direct his path. It seems well for us who have the interest of the Rochester Theological Seminary at heart, to orient ourselves. The dedication of this building cannot be accompanied by anything more fitly than by a careful inquiry into the purpose which the building is to subserve. I propose to you, therefore, as the subject of this address: The True Idea of Theological Education, and the Requisites to its Realization. In other words, what ought to be our aim in such a Seminary as this, and what are the means needful to secure it?

The training of the ministry, — it is a short phrase, but to unfold its mean-

*An Address delivered at the Dedication of Rockefeller Hall, Rochester Theological Seminary, May 19, 1880.

ing will require thought and care. It implies conviction on our part that there is a set of men specially called by Christ, the ascended Savior and Head of the church, to be the proclaimers of his salvation and the spiritual teachers of his people. It implies conviction that the work of preaching Christ and the wide range of his truth as it is made known in the Scriptures demands an intellectual and religious preparation beyond that of any mere human calling. It implies that the duty of training their preachers is just as imperative upon the churches as the duty of training their converts — the work of the Holy Spirit not superseding the work of the church in the one case any more than in the other. It implies that the provision for this training, since it has to do with the infinite and eternal interests of men's souls and of God's kingdom, should be the most ample and complete that our wisdom can devise and that is warranted by the means Providence has placed at our disposal.

The only effective provision for such training is that of the Theological Seminary. Happily we do not need at this time and in this presence to reiterate the old arguments in favor of special Seminaries of theological instruction. Experience is teaching us anew every day that this mighty rushing age can be taken captive for Christ only by men abreast of its highest culture and possessed of an intellectual energy equal to its own. Our greatest success in establishing efficient churches has been precisely in those quarters of the land where we have longest had an advanced training for our ministers. We have learned that college education alone will not fit a young man for the ministry, any more than it will fit him for medicine or the law,— special study of his own profession is requisite in each of these separate callings, if we would secure the highest quality of service in those whom we employ. And we have given over expecting training for our young ministers, that meets the demands of the age, at the hands of settled pastors. They have not the time to give to special instruction of young men,— even when they have the minute acquaintance with the several branches of theological knowledge which is needed in a competent teacher. It is a settled principle among us that this instruction can be secured for the vast majority of our young preachers only by the maintenance of institutions in which each department of sacred learning is represented by a teacher who makes it his lifelong work and specialty.

What these departments should be is by no means an arbitrary matter. Both their number and their subjects are determined by the necessities of the case. For the theology in which we desire the rising ministry to be instructed is primarily a Biblical Theology, a theology rooted and grounded in Scripture, a theology which unfolds and applies the word of God as the material and the directory of preaching. First of all, then, the student must learn to read his Bible, for himself, as he can only do, by knowing the original languages in which that Bible was written, and by applying to it the principles of sound grammatical and exegetical interpretation. This study of the Bible naturally divides itself into work upon the Old Testament, and work upon the New. The Hebrew of the former, and the Greek of the latter, must receive equal attention, as the vehicles of God's communications to men. Thus we see the necessity of the two departments of Hebrew and Greek. But to a well-furnished expounder of God's work is needed some-

thing more than personal command of the instruments of investigation; he must know how the Spirit of God has led the church of earlier days to interpret the Scriptures, and what the results of such interpretation have been upon the church's life. Thus we come to recognize the indispensableness of a third department, that namely of Historical Theology, with its two branches, the History of Doctrine, which gives account of the progressive apprehension by the church of the truth of Scripture and the shaping of that truth into doctrinal statements; and Church History, which describes the resulting and accompanying changes in the life of the church itself.

We must go still further. The thoughtful mind must systematize the results of Scripture study, must gather into a well proportioned and organic whole the scattered facts which the Bible gives him. In the light of past errors and with the help of past interpretations, he must build these materials into a consistent scheme which he can defend against the reasonings of the sceptic and harmonize with the facts of nature and consciousness. Hence arises the need of a fourth department — Systematic Theology. Systematic Theology is nothing more nor less than the study of Scripture truths in their connections, the recognition of their divine unity as the revelation of one God and Redeemer, the justification of them as consistent with every other portion of our knowledge. But lastly, there must be a fifth department of Practical Theology, in which this system of truth is considered as a means of renewing and sanctifying men. We do not study theology as mere abstract science, but solely with a view to its publication and enforcement. Not a single one of the departments I have previously mentioned, that does not daily make plain to the student its connections with preaching and life. But in a Seminary for the education of preachers, there needs to be a department that devotes itself exclusively to the side of practice. To this department belong Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, since these are but scientific presentations of the right methods of unfolding Christian truth and of bringing it to bear upon men, in public and in private. You can see at once that these five departments of Hebrew, Greek, History, Doctrine, Preaching, are all essential to the complete training of the minister; and that the range of thought and of literature in each is so great, that the mastery of any single one, so as properly to teach it, is enough to furnish the sole occupation of the most laborious and able instructor.

It may be said that the students of the Seminary are but beginners; that the training they need is training in the elements; that those who give this elementary teaching do not need to be so far advanced beyond their pupils. A little consideration, however, will suffice to show how mistaken is this reasoning. The best of elementary teaching can be given only by one who is a master of his subject; the highest art is required to simplify that which is recondite and profound. None but a thoroughly furnished and experienced teacher can meet the intellectual demands of classes of college graduates, some of whom at least have inquisitive and penetrating minds. Nor would it be safe to entrust to instructors of minor ability the answering of the perplexing and critical questions with which the youthful student is beset at the first stage of his theological inquiries. Not everything can be done in three years of study, but it is of infinite importance that what is done should be done aright. To form proper methods of Scripture interpreta-

tion, to lay the foundation stones of Christian doctrine so that the superstructure shall be safe, to adopt right ideals of preaching and of pastoral work,—these things are all-important; and the securing of these results demands the most thorough scholarship on the part of the teacher, combined with a strong personality and a power of imparting what he knows to others.

Here we have five departments of instruction, the maintenance of which is essential to a liberal course of theological training. I have not spoken of other departments which might be added, and which some day will be added, for I confine myself to the immediate and the practical. Ever since this Seminary began, instruction in all these branches has been given. The only change has been in applying more and more fully the principle of division of labor. The Hebrew and the Greek, which in the early days of the institution were taught by a single professor, now have each the separate services of a competent man, and in like manner Homiletics and Theology now constitute two departments, whereas they once constituted but one. The older graduates of the Seminary, as they return to their Alma Mater, can mark the increased range and thoroughness of work that have resulted from this change. The question with us now, is with regard to the proper support of these departments, and the accumulation of an endowment sufficient to put the work in each of them beyond the contingencies of failing interest and of financial reverses. Many times even in these later years we have asked ourselves whether it was our duty to cut down the salaries of professors to correspond with a revenue diminished by hard times and by decrease in the current rates of interest. But this has always seemed a false step to take. We want the best service that can be procured. We cannot obtain the men who will do the work required, for a sum less than average salaries of our city pastors. Nor can we expect to keep men, who are continually offered more for their services in other positions. We should act with the same wisdom as that which great railroad corporations show, when they attract and keep their best employees by a fixed and sufficient compensation. Endowment funds should furnish to the teachers a support equal to that which they could command in other spheres of ministerial work. The grinding economy which is compelled to abridge the education of the family and to relinquish every luxury, is not the best condition for successful teaching. Perpetual anxiety about matters of finance, in the Seminary or in the household, is not consistent with a complete devotion to the work of acquiring and imparting knowledge. The health and mental vigor of the ordinary pastor require reinforcement by occasional recreation and rest. It is not different with the average professor. But recreation and rest involve expense. It is a mistaken economy to render these impossible, through the insufficiency of his compensation. I am not now speaking of what is, nor of what must be, but simply of what should be, in a fully equipped educational institution. Much valuable work has been done by small and struggling seminaries of learning; but, as culture and wealth increase, it is found by other bodies of Christians, and it will be found by us, that the best security for faithful work on the part of the instructor is a pecuniary support sufficient to relieve him from distracting cares, and to permit his exclusive attention to the task he has been set to do.

What I have said with regard to the thoroughness of teaching requisite in such an institution as this, implies that back of the actual instruction there should be solidity of learning. The Seminary must be a store-house, as well as an apparatus for distribution ; a reservoir, as well as a net-work of canals. It is an institution of learning in the broadest sense. It is not only to give out instruction in the present, but it is to preserve the knowledge of the past, and to add to its stock. For this purpose, it needs to be provided with the instruments of investigation. It needs a library, in which are gathered the treasures of past thought with regard to the word of God and the history of the church. Whatever investigations may be conducted into the meaning of Scripture or the bearing upon it of ethnological or linguistic science, should find the needful books at hand to render them successful. Students of varying tastes should find, each for himself, the volumes adapted to stimulate their thought and to prompt original inquiries. Missionary biographies should draw out the missionary spirit. Devotional reading should be furnished in the prayers and experiences of holy men in all the ages past. And to make this array of literature accessible, there should be a librarian who can be at the service of the student through all the working hours of the day. Add to the Library, a Museum of Geography and Archæology, that will furnish, in object-lessons, all proper aids to the understanding of the Holy Land, its customs and its configuration. Add to these a Lectureship, which shall each year bring the student in contact with distinguished preachers and scientists, in brief courses of lectures upon the subjects to which they have given special attention. Only with a liberal supply of these various helps, literary, topographical and personal, can the teacher do his best work of instruction, or be himself most thoroughly master of the department to which he has devoted himself.

These teachers and helps being provided, the Seminary is ready for its work of instruction. The method of that instruction is of more importance than the helps or the men. We point with satisfaction to the past history of Rochester, and to the men who have gone out from this Seminary, as a full justification of what we deem the peculiarities of the institution. The aim has been, from its beginning, to teach the student to think for himself. We would not permit him to be the mere passive recipient of other men's learning; we would not have him the lifeless repeater of a second-hand orthodoxy. The true aim of theological instruction should be to cultivate the habit of theological thought, to enable the pupil to grasp with his own mind, in his own way, the fundamental truths of Scripture, and to acquire the power of analyzing, arranging and presenting the results of his own thinking, for the quickening and instruction of others. Instead of cramming down the student's throat a ready-made scheme of doctrine, he is to make every point a battle-ground, and win his way to assured faith, through conquest of fairly recognized difficulties. Discussion, instead of being a mere by-play, is an indispensable requisite to right theological training — discussion that sharpens the wits, separates the wheat of substantial truth from the chaff of mere phrases, questions mere forms of human devising that it may build its faith on the simple deliverances of God's word. A theological "Seminary," where open question and answer is a forbidden thing in the lecture-room, is almost a contradiction in terms. All our traditions

favor, nay demand, unlimited liberty of inquiry. Not to repeat by rote certain stereotyped expressions do we send out our graduates, but to speak out each his own convictions of truth, arrived at by personal study of Scripture, and made vivid by his personal experience.

To accomplish this result requires a happy combination of circumstances. Physical, social and religious influences all need to be brought to bear upon the growing mind and heart of the student. Among the physical influences, in addition to properly warmed and ventilated rooms for study and for class-exercises, such as we have secured in this building, may be counted that of a well-appointed Gymnasium. A sound body is the condition of a healthy mind. The best of intellectual work can be done only when the physical system is in a state of vigor, and this can be maintained only by daily exercise. If our climate were more propitious, we might trust to out-of-door walks to provide this. But so large a portion of our Seminary year is wet and forbidding, that opportunity for in-door exercise such as gymnastic apparatus would afford, is eminently desirable. There is moreover an element of recreation in this form of physical training, when pursued by young men in companies, which adds very greatly to its effectiveness. The Gymnasium should have attached to it rooms for bathing, that cleanliness and exercise may go together. The palæstra of the Greeks united these two, and the period of the highest physical development was also the period of the noblest ancient art and civilization.

Among these physical conditions, I should be inclined to lay special emphasis upon the training of the vocal organs, if it were not that this discipline of the voice is also a discipline of expression, and so involves a higher intellectual element. A generous friend of the Seminary has enabled us to make an excellent beginning in elocutionary instruction. There can be no doubt that this should constitute a part of Seminary teaching from the commencement to the end of the course : for a clear articulation, a pure tone, a manly address, are absolute essentials to success in pulpit oratory. But I pass to consider a final but most important question respecting the physical and material side of seminary life, namely, the question of support. How shall the majority of students find the means to prosecute their work ? I say the majority, for the fact stares us in the face, that but a very small minority of theological students are blessed, by inheritance, with this world's goods. Since the days of the apostles, God has called the poor rather than the rich to be his ministers. The most of Seminary students come from small churches in the country towns — churches that have hard struggle to maintain their own existence, and are quite unable to support these foster-children of theirs through the long ten years of preparatory, collegiate and theological education. There are but two resources. These young men must support themselves, or they must receive aid. They cannot support themselves, without greatly prolonging their course of study and depriving the churches of some of their best years of service. With the increasing demands of our Seminary curriculum, requiring as it does for its successful prosecution the whole time and all the strength of the ablest men, it becomes a serious and even dangerous strain upon the constitution of the student, to add to this regular work of the course the work of providing for his own support. Many and many a valuable man has been broken for life by

attempting to carry through his studies independently of foreign aid. The whole system of beneficiary help proceeds upon the principle that it is a saving to the churches to economize the time and the strength of its young ministers. They have given up all hope of worldly gain in order to devote their lives to the service of the churches,—it is only reasonable that the churches should enable them to make their preparation for this service as brief and as thorough as possible.

The chief difficulty connected with the subject is that of determining the form and the extent to which this aid shall be given. There has been a feeling, on the part of some, that the reception of such aid by the student tended to destroy his manliness and independence. I conceive that this impression ignores the real relation between the parties. Whatever funds are contributed for this purpose are given to Christ's cause, and with a view to the benefit of the churches. They are distributed to students for the ministry, not as a personal gratuity, but as a means of fitting them more quickly for their work of serving Christ. What is given for Christ's sake, they may take for Christ's sake. It is money belonging to their Lord, and bestowed by him. There is no more discredit or humiliation in taking what pecuniary aid he gives, than in taking the spiritual aid he gives from day to day. It is duty to take it, rather than to narrow and abridge the work of preparation, by devoting any considerable part of the time for study, to work for personal maintenance. No young man feels his manliness or his honor compromised by receivlng from his father the means of education. There is no more dishonor in receiving the means of education from the churches.

I am aware that there are occasional instances of unworthy men who misuse their opportunities and seek aid from interested motives. I am persuaded that the number of such is very small. The fact that any such exist should render us careful in selecting the objects of our beneficiary appropriations, but should not lead us to doubt the principle upon which we act. The great majority of theological students, although not free from faults of character, are yet true men, desirous of living for God's glory, and for men's salvation. I believe that there is quite as much danger of harming them by ungenerous treatment, as by over-liberality. The utmost appropriation made to any one student by the Ministerial Union for the last few years has been $130 per year. The expenses of a Seminary course must be $200 per year, even with the extremest economy. The idea that on this $130 a student can live in luxury, is a very mistaken one. My own conviction is that it is all too meagre, and that $150, instead of $130, should henceforth be the limit of aid. If out of this small sum, supplemented by his vacation-work, the student can save a little for the purchase of books, so much the better. Let the gathering of the foundation for a library be the reward of economy and industry. Money could hardly be put to better use than in purchasing a few of the best books to serve as tools in his opening ministry.

I am convinced moreover that this appropriation of $150 per year should be made as an out and out gift, and not in the way of a loan. To lay upon a young man at his entrance into his work the burden of a heavy debt, is to handicap him in the race. In the case of a sensitive spirit, it is to cow and discourage him from the very outset. In a small parish, with many neces-

sary expenses at the first, and with salary only sufficient for the barest maintenance, the payment of such a debt for one's education involves the struggle and anxiety of years. Such a debt renders it impossible for many a young man to enter honorably upon the service of a small and feeble church, and stifles his impulses to missionary self-sacrifice. His first duty seems to be to clear off his incumbrances. So the churches suffer, as well as he. Rather than incur a debt, which he foresees will thus hamper him and forbid a whole hearted service in the ministry, many a noble man refuses to accept aid at all; attempts to maintain himself during his Seminary course by preaching or by secular work; by consequence lowers his standard both of preaching and of study; or if he succeeds in accomplishing both, as only one man in ten can do, injures himself in health, and so imposes a mortgage of another sort upon his whole future. In view of these considerations, it is my earnest desire that the Board of this Seminary may see the way clear to a total abolition of the loan-system so far as it applies to beneficiary aid. I would even cancel all notes heretofore given in return for such aid, and take such notes in future only in cases where the student prefers the loan, rather than the gift. Our loan-system was devised only as a temporary expedient to bridge over the time of annually recurring deficits, and to bring back into the treasury for future use the money that was once paid out. But may we not believe that, as Providence has raised up in the past those who could appreciate our needs, so in the future there will be found those who will be glad to provide a Scholarship Fund, the income of which shall meet this regular and fundamental need of support on the part of our students, at least so far as it is not provided for by the annual contributions of the churches?

It may be expected, in this connection, that I will give at least some notion of the safeguards which I would throw around this giving of beneficiary aid, so that it shall not be bestowed upon unworthy persons. I admit that not every young man who proposes to enter a Theological Seminary is a fit object of these gifts of the churches. But there are two tests which take no long time to apply, and which are well-nigh decisive. The first is that of intellectual activity, as shown by the student's mastery of the regular lessons of the course; and the second is that of moral activity, or the prosecution of some regular Christian work during his Seminary studies. It is remarkable how the lack of moral earnestness reacts upon the scholastic earnestness of the student, and how a whole-hearted piety shows itself in faithfulness to the daily duties of the study and the class-room. For this reason I would have the curriculum a rigorous one — so rigorous that nothing but industry and self-denying devotion to study can enable the pupil successfully to accomplish its requirements. I would set the standard so high that neither an indolent nor an incompetent man should be able to complete the course, and this intellectual test I would apply without fear or favor. We want not so much numbers, as quality, in the ministry — men disciplined, alert, energetic; and the Theological Seminary is the very place where these qualities shall be encouraged and trained. It is not so easy to see into the heart and discern the motive, but you can look into the examination-papers and discern whether hard work has been done, and in the vast majority of cases that hard work will be the evidence of an honest mind and

a determination to do service to God. I would not only make the reception of beneficiary aid dependent absolutely upon the attainment of a high scholastic standard — this we have already done — but I would go a step further, and, within certain limits, graduate the amount of such aid to the thoroughness of the student's work.

I have alluded to the social conditions requisite to the full success of Seminary work. For the development of the student's mind and heart, for the cultivation of his powers of thought and feeling, the relation between professor and pupil needs to be a peculiar one. For the safe management of such an institution, there must of course be such a thing as government; and that government is not intrusted to the hands of the students, but to the Faculty and to the Board. There must never be the slightest doubt that there are rules and regulations to be submitted to, by every student, and that such submission is an indispensable condition of continued membership in the institution. But, to use Napoleon's phrase, the hand of iron may be incased in a glove of velvet. There may be little show of authority, — little show of authority is necessary where the student recognizes himself as responsible for the maintenance of order, and is in the true sense a law unto himself. While, however, I urge steadfastly the recognition of the powers that be, in Seminary as well as in civil government, I desire to bring out very distinctly the complementary truth that the relation between professor and pupil here is not simply that which is common in the High School or the College, but is a higher, closer, more familiar relation. The students of the Seminary are grown men; they are commonly mature in mind; some of them have had experience in life; they have often been teachers themselves; they are all Christian men, or are so regarded; they have professedly devoted themselves without reserve to the service of Christ. To such as these the Professor must hold the relation not simply of the instructor to his pupils, or of the gentleman to those whom he meets in the common intercourse of life. There must mingle with it something of the paternal and the pastoral element. Mutual affection will admit a discreet familiarity. The teacher will believe all things of the pupil; take for granted his good purpose; be open and accessible and serviceable; aim to carry with him the moral sentiment of his classes; rule not by compulsion but by love.

I would make this Seminary an institution where every day's exercises should be a series of examples in Pastoral Theology; where the student should learn how to rule his church, by the methods by which his teachers rule him. I do not mean that the analogy is complete. There is a government here that goes beyond the consent of the governed; there may be now and then an ill-conditioned mind that is not impressed by the consideration with which he is treated, and that mistakes Christian courtesy for weakness. Such a man must be gratified by an exhibition of force; but it need not be the thunderbolt,— there are quiet forces equally effective; it may be intimated to him that the evidence of his call to the ministry is not judged to be sufficient to warrant the continuance of his studies. At all costs it must be understood that there are "powers that be," and that these powers are "ordained of God." But still I insist that this disciplinary aspect of Seminary government should seldom be visible. Into all the relations of Faculty

and students the social element should enter. There should be an intimacy of acquaintance, a readiness on the one hand to ask, and on the other hand to give, counsel and help, that is unknown in lower and secular schools. There are other types of influence — the purely and severely intellectual, the mandatory and arrogant — but they do not belong to an institution for the training of pastors, where the inner impulse to all duty is the spirit of Christ. I would make this institution a training-school in Christian love, for it is this alone that can make the work of the ministry successful.

Such a spirit as this can be maintained only by constant efforts and expedients, on the part of professors and students alike. The Professor's house and study should be not unknown to the student. There is a social culture and tact which is of the greatest value to the pastor, and for lack of which many able men fail to retain their influence over their churches. The student who comes from obscure surroundings has often had but the smallest opportunity to acquire this proper knowledge of the world. Anything that will make it easier for professors to invite students to their homes, and to introduce them to their families, will be of inestimable benefit. For the average student, away from his own home, and associating constantly with men like himself, there are temptations to a disregard of the conventional proprieties, which will be greatly lessened by insight into pleasant household life from time to time through his course of study. The monotony of an unvarying routine will be informed with a new life and spirit by reason of the change. There is much that the Christian men and women of our city churches may do, in this way, for our coming ministry. But the chief responsibility, so far as it is a responsibility at all, must rest upon the members of the Faculty. Their power and opportunity are limited, — but these might be greatly increased, if the provision of Professor's houses could bring them close together, and thus enable them easily to combine their efforts. The glimpses of home-life and of pleasant society thus rendered possible, would repay a large expenditure, by furnishing a needed preparation for the sudden entrance into social relations with his church, which so often forms the ordeal of the young minister.

This leads me to say that the proper place for the Theological Seminary is the large city, for there these influences of association are most varied and strong. Mr. Herbert Spencer, among his many half-truths and perversions of the truth, has suggested one thought which none will be disposed to deny, namely, that other things being equal, the rapidity and degree of intellectual progress is proportioned to the variety of environment. It is indeed the old truth in new dress — Experience is the best teacher. The young man who is thrust into a variety of positions, and is compelled to adapt himself to them as they come, will have a command of his resources and an education of his powers, such as cannot belong to the mere novice. For this reason the Theological Seminary ought to be where the currents of life are strong, and where much can be seen of things and of men. The country village will do for the Academy, but the College belongs to the town, and the Theological Seminary to the city. Let the boy be secluded, while his habits and principles are still forming; but, when he has got his growth, let him see something of the world in which he is to live and struggle. The knowledge he thus acquires will prepare him for the conflicts that are before him in the

future. Particularly is it desirable that the young man who is to be a leader of Christ's people should, by personal acquaintance with well-organized and thoroughly aggressive churches, and by personal observation of excellent examples of preaching, be stimulated to emulate their virtues in the instruction and pastoral care of his own flock. I count this knowledge of Christian life in a large city as one of the social influences which most tend to broaden the mind and heart of the young preacher.

This room, with its church-like appointments, witnesses that there is a yet deeper need in Seminary life than the social one which I have mentioned. It is well to provide the means of intercourse with society — but it is beyond all account more essential to provide means of intercourse with God. In the secluded life of the Seminary there will always be temptations to an abstract intellectualism. They need to be counteracted continually by devotion and by religious work. Mrs. Stowe once remarked that the theological students that she had seen were the most irreverent of men. It was, I think, the misjudgment of an acute observer, inferring more than was just, from the freedom of students' disputations with each other. Yet here is a danger, against which we need continually to guard. Familiarity with even sacred things, unqualified by the spirit of prayer and of Christian effort for others, tends ever to contempt. And therefore I would regard prayer as a regular part of Seminary work. As the apostles gave themselves to prayer and to the ministry of the word, so the theological student should give himself to prayer and to the study of the word. Indeed, Luther's old maxim is true: "*Bene orasse est bene studuisse*,"— true praying is true studying. Coleridge could call prayer the intensest exercise of the human understanding, and it is certain that, without it, there can be no valuable exercise of the human understanding upon any theme with which the preacher or pastor has to deal.

I count the meeting for prayer in which professors and students gather on a common level at noon of every day, and the regular service with which the exercises of every afternoon are closed, as an essential part of our Seminary training. Here the student may learn that his teachers are something more than teachers,— that they have hearts throbbing with the same emotion of love to Christ which he himself feels within him. And here the professor may see an aspect of his pupil's life which he had not suspected before, and may more wisely and more sympathetically adapt his instruction to individual needs. But above all, the drawing near to the Father of all, and to Jesus Christ the head of the church, through the Holy Spirit, in order that we may offer to him our worship and supplicate forgiveness and favor for ourselves and for mankind, is an essential to Seminary life. I make no doubt that from this room, with its prayers and its words of Christian experience and exhortation, will be dated the most lasting and valuable of the influences of this institution. Here may the presence of God evermore abide! Here may Christ manifest himself as Savior and Lord! Here may the Holy Spirit sanctify and energize the souls of those who are to preach to men of sin and of salvation!

Thus I have sketched the essentials and the appurtenances of a properly organized Theological Seminary. The ideal is surely not too high,— all that I have indicated, so far as material aids are concerned, has been already

provided in Seminaries of other denominations. To put our own Seminary in possession of the means to realize the plan I have laid before you would require indeed a large sum of money. But God has been so good to us in the past, and we so confidently trust that this is his own cause, that we cannot doubt that we shall see everything that has been sketched to-day, provided for by his good Providence. Such an institution as this is one of the most permanent things on earth. Directly connected as it is with the hopes and progress of the kingdom of God, remembered as it is daily in the prayers of God's elect, he that gives to it, gives to God, and puts his hand to a work that is sure to triumph. The friend who has given to us this beautiful and commodious building will have not only the comfort of knowing that he has linked himself and his name inseparably with the ever progressing cause of ministerial education, but for generations to come what he has done will be a stimulus and incitement to others to lay down like precious gifts at the feet of Jesus our Lord. With all the other generous benefactions which have fallen to us for Library and for endowments, even while so many wants are yet unsupplied, it rouses within me something of a prophetic spirit. I rejoice in it most of all because it is a foregleam of the dawn, a sign of the coming of that final day when "the rebuke of God's people"— the poverty and weakness and contempt under which his cause has suffered — shall be taken away, and the riches of the world shall be poured into the treasury of the Redeemer. May God hasten the day! And as a means of furthering this end, we now proceed in solemn prayer to dedicate this structure to the glory of God and to the special work of training his ministers. With the offering, let us dedicate ourselves. May he generously deign to accept us and our gift, and to use both for the furtherance and triumph of his everlasting kingdom. "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be the glory forever. Amen!"

XXVIII.

TRAINING FOR LEADERSHIP.*

It is a pleasant thing, on my first visit to Hamilton, to meet with so cordial a welcome. I am one of the sons of that wilful daughter of yours who, thirty-five years ago, ran away from home and set up a family of her own. These matches often turn out better than was expected. England is getting to be proud of America, and Hamilton to be proud of Rochester. And to-day, in view of all I see about me — this lovely country, this noble structure, these evidences of comprehensive and far-sighted liberality — I can truly say that Rochester is proud of Hamilton, and is glad to trace back the stream of her history to this sacred eminence, and through this to another that commands us both, namely, to "Sion hill" and

> "Siloa's brook that flowed
> Fast by the oracle of God."

In dedicating this new and beautiful building, the first question one might well ask is: What is it for? I am not content with the obvious and common-place answer, that it is designed to provide facilities for the education of ministers or preachers or pastors of our churches. That is all true — so true that it fails to make any great impression upon us. There is one aspect of our common work which has failed to receive sufficient recognition, and which I would emphasize to-day. Without questioning any of the other ends which are to be sought and attained here, I wish to speak of Training for Leadership in the church of Christ, as an end which of itself and by itself justifies all that has been given and all that has been done in the erection of this noble hall, and in the founding and support of this whole congeries of institutions. My first proposition is, that *the church must have leaders*. It is a necessity of nature. She will have them whether she wants them or not. Love of power is an instinct of human nature — an innocent and proper instinct. Men seek to acquire power over others, and ought to seek it,— for how else can they better the world? Christ had this love of power, and Satan was very artful in appealing to it when he offered him all the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them. The evil lay, not in seeking power, but in seeking it at times and in ways opposed to the will of the Father. So the Christian is not to give up his will, but to have more will; not to be devoid of ambition, but to have a holy ambition; not to renounce power, but to seek power and use power for God. "Seekest thou great things for thyself? Seek them not." But then, "Covet earnestly the best gifts"— gifts of government and leadership, among the rest. Christ is the great Leader, Captain, Shepherd. We may well desire to be shepherds,

*An address delivered at the dedication of the Theological Hall, Hamilton, N. Y., June 16, 1886.

captains, leaders, under him. And so the New Testament recognizes men who are "over" others in the Lord, praises the elders that "rule well," gives to pastors the title of "bishops" or "overseers," and exhorts the churches to "submit" to them and to "follow" them.

Now I am as good a Congregationalist in church government as any of you, and if it were necessary I could put in as many qualifications of this doctrine as any of you could. We have only "one Master," and "all we are brethren." While the government of the church as respects the divine source of the authority is an absolute monarchy, as respects the ascertainment and interpretation of God's will it is an absolute democracy. No man therefore has any business to lord it over God's heritage. Jesus says: "I am among you as one that serveth;" "he that would be chief among you, let him be your servant." Preëminence is to be preëminence only in service. But nothing of all this is inconsistent with leadership in the church of Christ, — for this leadership is nothing but moral suasion, the natural influence of strong character and sagacious planning, the irresistible force of the mind and heart and will which the Holy Spirit has informed and energized. You cannot prevent such leadership, even among the Plymouth Brethren, with all their fear that church organizations will become machines and that pastors will become bishops. Human nature craves human leadership. It never will be satisfied with an abstract and distant God to worship. It must have a kingdom with a Son of man for King, and an army in which the chosen representatives of this Son of man are lieutenants and leaders. So we are bidden to seek out and set apart men for this sacred service, and it will be a great day for the church when she feels her need of men like Paul and Augustine and Luther and Wesley, and prays mightily to God to raise up a multitude of such to be leaders of his people.

My second proposition is, that *these leaders must be trained.* If men are to be leaders, then they must be able to lead. They must themselves be in advance of those who are to follow. Of course I believe in natural gifts and endowments. Blood is thicker than water. The sons of ministers, other things being equal, make better ministers than their fathers were. They belong in the ministry, and I claim them for the Lord Jesus. I have no sympathy with the idea that the church must take up with what is left, after law and medicine and mining and journalism have had their pick. Pray God that more able and enthusiastic and persuasive and faithful men may be born. But it is not enough to be born. Nature is something, but nurture is something more. These men who are to go before their fellows in knowledge and zeal, in enterprise and devotion, must be trained for their work. Birth did a great deal for Paul, but he never would have been the apostle to the Gentiles, if he had not had the Rabbinic schools, and Gamaliel for a teacher. Knowledge of the world, variety of environment, contact with broad minds, social culture, all these go to make up the difference between a Peter and a Paul.

I insist upon it that men can be trained for leadership, — that is, natural gifts can be improved. Confidence may be aquired, methods can be taught. There is a great deal of training for leadership outside the schools. Leadership is in large part a matter of will, of determination, of habit, of example. The young man sees others bravely striding to the front, and he says: "By

God's grace I can do the same." Difficulty trains men. Exigency draws out their powers. Success in a small field prepares them for success in a greater. Even here in this world, he that has been faithful over a few things is made ruler over many things. I know that God needs men of different sorts in his ministry, and that he calls men of many sorts. The little country village needs a pastor,—and God raises up a man to fill that particular place. He needs a broad, flexible, magnetic personality for the great city, —and he provides such a one for that place. He needs energy, enterprise, intense devotion, the martyr-spirit in a foreign field,—and the man for that is forthcoming. But I protest against the notion that there is a hard and and fast line that separates these various fields—a great gulf fixed between them, so that no man can pass. I rather hold that honest work in the one may train one for work in another. And it is not a sin but a duty to fill the largest place we can, to reach the greatest number and the highest class of minds, to exert the strongest and most permanent influence for God. If I can hew down two trees for God, and yet content myself with felling one, I am responsible to God for the two. And if by hard work I can prepare myself for the larger service, if by severe training I can double my influence, then training is a duty. The world is perishing meantime, you say? Yes, but it is not perishing for lack of foolish preaching. If God had wanted you in the ministry before this, he would have had you born earlier. If he has waited for your appearance till 1886, he can wait till you know something of the truth you are to preach, even if it takes till 1896 for you to learn it.

I have only one other proposition, this namely, that *training for leadership is the peculiar duty of our Seminaries.* By this I mean, that we fail in our proper purpose, if we do not make the training of leaders a determining idea in our work. We cannot educate the whole church of Christ, nor all the ministers of the church. If we should attempt it, we should simply be swamped by a mass of material we could not manage, and the very heterogeneous character of that mass would put the gravest difficulty in the way of effectively teaching anything. The Theological Seminary never yet has trained, and for generations to come it will not train, even the majority of our ministers, and it is not our duty to turn it into a theological Kindergarten in order that it may do this. It is not our business to cover the whole field of education, even in the case of those whom we do teach. We cannot give instruction in all the departments of human knowledge. We cannot teach the elements of English. We cannot teach the elements of Greek. We ought not to teach even the elements of Hebrew. The elements of English belong to the common school; the elements of Greek belong to the Academy; the elements of Hebrew properly belong to the college,—and it was once an honor to Madison University that she, almost alone of the colleges, recognized this fact. The Theological Seminary is not a common school, nor an academy, nor a college, and we need practically to insist upon this, if we intend to train the leaders of religious thought and life for the coming generation. Let us insist upon it that the men who enter our Seminaries shall, as a condition of admission, give evidence either that they have had the drill of the common school, the academy and the college, or that they have pursued studies which fit them to do efficient work in the same classes with common school, academy and college graduates.

But now, granting that we have the right men to teach, and that we do not attempt to teach everything, how may we best arrange our Seminary work so as to train men for leadership? I reply that we must first give men faith — something to believe, and then belief in that something,— belief in its importance, belief in its right to rule, and belief in the God who has power to make it rule. You never can lead other people unless you are thoroughly persuaded yourself; no doubts, no fears,— because you know that you have truth and God upon your side. And so the teaching of doctrinal and ethical truth is the first way in which the Theological Seminary can make men leaders. But there is a right way and a wrong way of teaching that truth,— the one way will help men to be leaders, and the other will not. There is the critical, the polemic, the apologetic way,— a way that makes a man sharp-scented for heresy, eager for theological warfare, interested in doctrine because of its purely intellectual and speculative aspect,— and I wish to say with all emphasis that the merely speculative and closet theologian will never be a leader of men. He is too narrow. He has mastered the truth, but the truth has never mastered him. There is a broader sort of study — study with the heart as well as with the intellect, study that fills the soul with truth, and makes it seem a priceless possession which it would be cowardice and sin not to give to others, so that it may make them free as it has made us free. It is the constructive and not the destructive habit of mind that we need to cultivate, the spirit of the propagandist, in the best sense of that word, by which I mean the spirit that merges self in the truth, until it has but one end in life — to bring men to the knowledge and obedience of the truth.

But even this does not exhaust the list of our responsibilities and duties in the Seminary. Men who are merely possessed of the truth, and eager for its triumph, may be fanatics — with no ability to adapt it to the actual wants and conditions of men. If we would make men leaders, therefore, we must make our courses of study excel on the practical as well as on the theoretical side. The men who teach in the Theological Seminary should, where this is possible, be men who have had not only practical experience as pastors, but practical success as pastors. There should be constant practice in Sunday school and mission work in connection with the scholastic duties of the Institution, and at least occasional preaching should be encouraged, in order that the student may have continually in view the end to which he is to address his labors. He must learn to bring himself, and so to bring the truth, in contact with men. All true leadership is simply leading individual men. You cannot lead men in the mass. You cannot lead men by preaching alone. They will not believe that you care for them, unless you come to them privately and personally; and you cannot get other Christians to go after them, unless you set the example of going after them yourself. If I might be permitted to speak of my own experience, I would say that the critical points in my history as a minister have been, not so much the times of preparation for sermons, as the times when after long struggle I brought myself to go to individual men and talk to them about their souls; or when I took my life in my hand to remonstrate with some erring Christian; or when I summoned up all my energies to ask some man of wealth for money for God's cause. And I think that the power to do this work is largely the

result of the example of Christian instructors and teachers. I appeal to you who are before me, if the words of private counsel which your teachers spoke to you in your youth did not do more for you than their formal instructions in the class-room. My dear brethren who teach in Theological Seminaries, let us appreciate this power that we have of private and personal influence upon our students. We can teach them best how to lead others, only by showing them that we are leaders ourselves. We can give to men who thought they never could do this work, the confidence that God can make them mighty, first of all to lead others to Christ, and then to lead them into the paths of Christian obedience and service. Let there be such a spirit of intellectual and religious life in these institutions, that the men who go out of them shall feel that they are not only bound to conquer circumstances and to lead men, but that with the help of God's Holy Spirit they can do it and will do it.

West Point is an institution where not the whole army is taught, nor yet all the officers of the army, but a few who can be fitted by natural powers and severe discipline to lead the rest. Training for leadership is the central idea of the Military Academy. Training for leadership should be the central idea of the Theological Seminary. Do you say that I narrow down unduly the range of Seminary work and of Seminary influence? I answer, I divide only to conquer. I would insist on the highest and widest culture at the top, only that the whole body of the ministry who have not enjoyed such advantages, may be stimulated to secure them. Education is not like vapor that rises, but like water that runs downward, from its source. Make the demands of the professional school greater, and the colleges will be forced to meet them, even as the growing demands of the colleges have to be met by our preparatory schools. I should be glad if this occasion could be improved by us who represent the theological schools of our denomination, so as to secure unity of action in maintaining the efficiency, and advancing the standard of our common work. But I remember what happened to that wise man among the Maories of New Zealand. The missionary asked the chief, why it was that the tribe had put him to death. And the reply was simply: "He gave us so much good advice, that we had to." While I wish all good things to all the Seminaries represented here, and especially to the Hamilton Theological Seminary which so hospitably entertains us, I remember the fate of that heathen sage, and take my seat before a worse thing happens to me.

XXIX.

ARE OUR COLLEGES CHRISTIAN?*

The opening sermon of the recent General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, delivered by its retiring moderator, Dr. Herrick Johnson, was chiefly devoted to setting forth the dearth of candidates for the ministry. Many startling facts were adduced, drawn mainly from the statistics of his own church, but all tending to show that, while there is a constantly increasing demand for men, there is a constantly diminishing supply. He compares the two decades — 1850–60 and 1870–80. During the first decade, twelve colleges furnished in the aggregate 5,011 graduates, of whom 1,486, or 29½ per cent., entered the ministry. During the last decade, these same colleges furnished in the aggregate 5,034 graduates, of whom 963, or only 19 per cent., entered the ministry. Dr. Johnson predicts a ministerial famine, if this state of things is suffered to continue.

Other denominations, besides the Presbyterians, have observed like facts within their own borders, and have felt a similar alarm. With greater or less degrees of emphasis, Episcopalians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists, and in our own denomination Drs. Hovey and Elder especially, have called attention to the danger, and have sought to trace it to its sources. Dr. Herrick Johnson rather summarily dismisses some of the common explanations, such as the trials and inadequate support of the ministry, the brilliant inducements held out by other callings, the intellectual demands made upon the modern preacher, and the lack of sufficient provision for college education. With regard to this last, he asserts that the colleges have more students, but fewer candidates. He very correctly ascribes the evil mainly to the merely secular and business view of the ministry which has come to obtain in our churches, and which has so largely supplanted the older and truer view of the ministry as a gift of God, for which the churches are dependent upon God, and for which they ought continually to pray.

If I were in any respect to criticise so excellent a presentation of the subject as Dr. Johnson has given us, I should do so upon the ground of its incompleteness. I should describe this secular view of the ministry as merely one mark of our age — an age of physical research and invention, of materialistic philosophy, and of worldly thought and ambition; and the recollection that the pendulum of thought is never stationary would furnish me with the basis for a prediction that we shall soon see, if indeed we are not already seeing, signs of a swing in the opposite direction of an idealistic and spiritual method of thought and action. I should also call attention to the fact that the evil spirit of the present age has to a considerable extent

* Printed in the Examiner, July 19, 1883.

succeeded in infecting our colleges, and that one important means of introducing the better day will be the bringing back of these institutions of learning to the spirit and methods of their founders. I am persuaded that, when our colleges become truly Christian, we shall have no lack of students for the ministry.

It is for a brief consideration of this last division of the subject, that what I have thus far said has prepared the way. There can be no doubt that our colleges — and by our colleges I mean simply our higher denominational schools — were intended to be Christian, in some more definite and palpable sense than that in which a college established and supported by the State can be said to be Christian; in some more definite and palpable sense than that in which the State itself can be said to be Christian. What is a Christian college, and what are its aims? It seems to me that a Christian college is an institution established and endowed by Christian people — people who believe in Christ as God and Savior, — to promote the kingdom of Christ by training young men's highest powers, intellectual, social and religious, for the service of Christ in the Church or in the State. That is not in the sense of the founders a Christian college, in which Christianity is something merely tacit and nominal. That only is a Christian college, in which Christianity is the confessed and formative principle of its whole organization, method and life. That only is a Christian college, which aims, by a truly liberal and Christian culture, to bring young men to Christ, to teach them of Christ, and to train them for Christ.

Let me analyze this idea, and separate the various elements that go to make it up. In a properly Christian college, first of all, it would seem that all the instructors should be actively Christian men. Theoretical belief is not enough. Christian profession is not enough. Mere technical mastery of a given department of knowledge, even when supplemented by ability to communicate, is only half of a true teacher's stock in trade. The other half is a certain mass of manhood. Personality counts for as much as instruction, — indeed, no true instruction is possible without a vigorous personality. It is the man that teaches, quite as much as his words. Now, in a Christian college, this manhood should be Christian manhood; this personality should be Christian personality. I know of no way of testing the tree but by its fruits. In every teacher of a Christian college, theoretical belief in Christ as Savior and God, should be accompanied by practical devotion to the service of Christ, and by active coöperation with Christ's appointed means — the ministry and the church.

In the second place, a Christian college should give actual Christian instruction, — in the word of God, the greatest classic; in the story of the church, the greatest history; in the doctrines of the Bible, the greatest science; in Christian ethics, the noblest morality. Why should the Christian Scriptures be the only great master-piece of literature unrepresented in the college curriculum? Why should Christian Theology be the only great science the elements of which are not taught in a college course? There are many ways of teaching religion, and I care not which of them is chosen; I only claim that religion should be systematically taught. Some of the greatest lawyers and statesmen of New England, in the last generation, ascribed their first understanding of the principles of government and law

to the doctrinal sermons of President Dwight, to which they listened when they were students at Yale. So long as the truth about God is the foundation of all other truth, it should form a fundamental part of the instruction of a Christian college.

The third requisite to a Christian college is, that its discipline and instruction should be pervaded with a Christian spirit. It is hard to put it into any form of words, but every one must see that only that college can be distinctively Christian in which high moral standards are insisted upon, in which sobriety and purity, honesty and honor are required as conditions of membership in the institution, — and required of teachers and students alike. The influence of a single teacher who is known to be intemperate or immoral, will destroy the force of all the formal instruction in ethics which such an institution can furnish, and will serve as an example and excuse for the worst excesses on the part of the students. The unreprehended practice of arts of deception in the recitation-room saps the very life of character, and the student who is lost to truth soon becomes lost to shame. The spirit of Christian courtesy and brotherhood — the docile and receptive mind and manner on the part of the students, the friendly and communicative temper on the part of those who teach — this social and mutually helpful spirit must be characteristic of the college, or it ceases to be Christian. "Dumb, driven cattle" on the one hand, and the rough task-master on the other, may despoil it of all that makes it worthy of the name.

Last of all, the Christian college should have for its one great aim to make its students servants of Christ — ministers of Christ or helpers of his church. It need not make all its students preachers — it should aim to make every soul of them a Christian. It should teach that life is thrown away unless spent in the service of the King. Not natural or political science first in importance, nor public honors most to be sought for, but the service of Christ, the truth of Christ, the favor of Christ — these are the most noble, the most beneficent, the most satisfying. And then this teaching should be supplemented by personal work, on the part of teachers and Christian students alike, for the conversion of souls. Amherst and Oberlin have shown how mighty an influence may be exerted by a few determined and devoted Christian men, when banded together in a college faculty, to infuse their own spirit into a multitude of Christian students, and to draw the great mass of the unconverted members of the college to Christ. The college prayer-meeting should be as regular a resort of the Professor as is his lecture-room. And the effort, by all manner of social and friendly intercourse, to effect the salvation of his pupils, should seem more important to him than to secure a high record of scholarship, — although I am persuaded that the latter will be greatly furthered by the former.

I have thus set forth what seem to me the requisites of a Christian college. It is interesting to know that in the Gymnasia of Germany — which most nearly of the German schools answer to our colleges, differing from them mainly in carrying their studies no further than to the end of our Junior year — most of the branches usually pursued in our Theological Seminaries are taught in an elementary though systematic form, and are taught to all. The Bible is studied from end to end; Hebrew is taught as well as Greek; church history and dogmatics form a part of the regular

course. And all this in institutions supported by the State, and by no means as a part of a training for the ministry, but as necessarily belonging to the liberal culture which every educated citizen should possess. Something like this was designed by the founders of our colleges. A knowledge of Hebrew and of Christian doctrine was once thought indispensable to a liberal training. Can any one doubt that such a scheme comes nearer to the idea of a Christian education than many of the schemes of instruction which now obtain in our so-called Christian colleges?

It is simple truth, though it may be unwelcome truth, that many of our colleges have ceased to be Christian, and that others are in danger of following their example. The spirit of indifferentism and agnosticism has invaded our temples of learning, until institutions originally dedicated to Christ and his church aspire to give a secular rather than a religious training. Now if this were merely the throwing off of a narrow denominationalism, we might have sympathy with it. I want no denominational college, in the sense of a machine for the propagation of the tenets of a particular denomination — a school for teaching a peculiar sort of ecclesiology. But the true denominational college — the college of which a particular body of Christians takes charge, in which it has pride, to which it gives its sons, its contributions and its prayers, and from which it looks for its leaders and teachers — the college which opens its doors freely to men of every creed, but which says to all: "No training is truly liberal which is not truly Christian; such training, and no other, we offer you" — such colleges as these are an indispensable need of our time, and all our education will play into the hands of unbelief, immorality and anarchy, when such colleges as these are lost to us.

The denominational college that is ashamed of Christ had better die. It *will* die, so far as its power for good is concerned. There can be no neutrality, and the intellectual activity that ceases to be Christian will soon become hostile to Christianity. It *will* die, so far as its support is concerned, for the Christian men, who took interest in it as a helper to the kingdom of Christ, will leave it when it ceases to be distinctively religious, and will send their sons either to other denominational colleges that are faithful to their trust, or to the larger and better endowed colleges of the State. A truly Christian college will appeal to the most sacred feelings and convictions of Christian people; will draw forth their most generous gifts; will attract from all parts of the land the sons of the land's best and noblest men. Such a college will be a light and a joy, not only to all the land, but to the whole earth. But if our denominational colleges are to be no more Christian than our State colleges, then the sooner they cease to be, the better; for the only valid argument for their separate and continued existence is that they alone can be pronouncedly and effectively Christian.

While I recognize with gratitude the progress which our colleges have made in certain literary and scientific directions, I urge, in this one respect of their Christian character, a return to the methods of the past, and a careful watching of their tendencies for the future. A great work has been done; but the times in which we live demand a new faithfulness to Christ in our systems of education. The compromising, secular spirit, if admitted to control, will prove the ruin of the cause which these institutions were established to further. Not in such ways have our past triumphs been won.

When I looked the other day, at Saratoga, upon the hundred and ten men from the University and the Theological Seminary at Rochester, who had gathered for a brief hour to recount their common experiences, and to express their gratitude to the institutions that had sent them forth, I thanked God and took courage. And when that body of men, who have certainly infused into our denomination a new spirit and impulse of Christian service, commissioned me to convey to Presidents Anderson and Robinson their deep sense of the inestimable benefits they had received from their teachings and from their example, I said to myself: "The school-master is abroad. The Christian schoolmaster is not dead. The Christian college still lives. Let us, with God's help, make it all that its name imports — all that it ought to be."

XXX.

NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION.*

My dear brother, after a protracted course of study, and after some preliminary work in which you have tested your strength, you have been honored by the call of our oldest Theological Seminary to be one of its corps of instructors, and by the ordination of this church and council to be a recognized minister of Jesus Christ. Between your election as teacher, and your setting apart as minister, there is a very natural connection. The work you are to do in expounding the New Testament is in itself a preaching of the gospel, and ordination to that work, after careful examination by the representatives of the churches, is by just so much the more proper and important, as the teaching of the teachers is a more responsible and difficult service than the preaching of the Gospel to an ordinary congregation. We need guarantees that the man intrusted with such responsibilities knows the truth which he proposes to teach, believes in its divine authority, has some sense of a call of God to interpret it, and some assurance of the aid of the Holy Spirit in his work. With regard to all of these matters, this afternoon's examination has laid to rest all doubts in the mind of either church or council, and we have proceeded to publish to the world our vote setting you apart to the gospel ministry, with an unusual conviction that in so doing we are only recognizing and ratifying what God has done before us. I congratulate you upon the new light that is thus thrown upon your own path and your own duty; upon the practical settlement of all questions with regard to your vocation and place of labor; and upon the manifest wisdom of God that has guided you, when blind, by a way that you knew not, and has led you at length to this opportunity of exceeding usefulness and of permanent influence upon the ministry and the churches of Jesus Christ.

The task has been assigned me, by the council, of giving to you a charge with regard to the duties, the methods, and the spirit, of your new work. I take pleasure in doing this, because I have known you so well, and have such confidence that you will be faithful. But the charge must be a peculiar charge. It will not be the ordinary charge to one who is to be pastor of a church, for you are not called to be a pastor. It will not deal with the merely common-place and superficial duties of your vocation, for these are patent to you already. It will not be dogmatic or assertatory, for no independent mind can be benefited by a substitution of the oracles of man for the oracles of God. I shall only attempt, in the brief time allotted me, to mention certain modern requisites to success in the department of teaching

* A Charge to the Candidate, at the Ordination of Mr. Ernest D. Burton, Acting Professor-elect in Newton Theological Institution; Rochester, June 22, 1883.

to which you are to devote yourself — the department of New Testament Language and Interpretation.

My first suggestion is, that you teach *thoroughly*. I do not now speak of mere accuracy in the matter of Greek forms, or of precise methods of statement in explaining them. I use the word thorough in its etymological sense. That is *thorough*, which goes *through* a subject — goes to the bottom of it. Modern scholarship is instinct with this spirit. It cannot tolerate a mere half-truth, when the whole truth is attainable. It cannot tolerate dogmatism upon a narrow basis of investigation. You will find students who will expect of you thorough work, and who will give you their confidence, only as you show that you have done thorough work before forming your opinions. There are certain questions of grammar, like the telic use of *ἵνα* or the meaning of the aorist; questions of chronology, like the date of the Savior's birth, or the definition of the feast in John's fifth chapter; questions as to the origin and date of the gospels; questions as to relative value of manuscript authorities; and these are questions upon which weighty results hang, and yet questions difficult to settle. The teacher of New Testament Greek must have an opinion upon them — an opinion of his own. But his opinion will be of little value to himself, or to his classes, unless it has been formed by prolonged and original investigation. On some of these questions, at least, he must show that he has formed such opinions, and has formed them in a safe way. This cannot be done all at once. No one has a right to expect a new teacher to have personally settled, at the very start, all the difficult questions of exegesis and theology. He must make his strong points, teach with emphasis what he knows, and for the rest refer to text-books written by others, or induce the student to investigate for himself. But though time is required, and long study goes to the solution of the more important problems, it is still possible for the teacher, year by year, to master one difficulty after another, and at last to give his teaching something like completeness and organic unity. As a help to this, let me urge you always, and from the very beginning, to have on your hands and before your eyes some one point of investigation of fundamental importance, upon which you are turning your most concentrated and continuous thought, with a view to putting the results into compact and written form. Nothing is more valuable to the teacher than to hold himself to the not infrequent, and somewhat regular, publication of articles upon special topics in his department. The prospect of a wider audience than that of the lecture-room, and of being judged by his peers, will stimulate him to harder work than he would otherwise be apt to do. Thoroughness and depth are not so easy as superficiality. But they are essential to good teaching, and the true teacher will not content himself without knowing more, about certain vital points of his subject, than is known by any other man in the world.

But there is a second characteristic of good teaching, that I would have you cultivate. I mean *breadth*. It is as important as depth. It is quite possible for the expounder of Scripture to be so minute and microscopic, in his examination of a passage, that all sense of its general scope and power vanishes from the mind of the pupil. While instances of absolutely exhaustive investigation are given, and given in sufficient number to teach the student a method and to put within him an impulse, the time given to

exegetical study in our Seminaries is all too brief to permit the teacher to go over any large portion of Scripture in this way. Reading considerable sections of the New Testament, whole Gospels and whole Epistles, at a rate which the minute exegete would regard as very rapid, and reading them mainly with a view to their broad general sweep of meaning, is just as important as the careful and exhaustive study of a few important passages. You are well aware that English exegesis has passed through several stages, such as the homiletical stage represented by Matthew Henry, the grammatical stage represented by Ellicott, and the historical stage represented by Lightfoot. I think it cannot be doubted that Lightfoot's Commentaries mark a great advance in the characteristic I am commending, namely, that of breadth. More attention is paid to introduction, to analysis of the portion of Scripture under treatment, to context, to the historical setting. Matthew Arnold's dictum, that the Scriptures must be interpreted as literature, has a certain truth in it, and a truth that must not be neglected. But how plain it is, that this broad treatment of the New Testament writings is safe and valuable only in the hands of a broad man. Much material is accessible to him in the voluminous literature of his subject both in English and in German, and of the German instruments of investigation he cannot long afford to be ignorant. A mind of philosophical tendencies, that by a sort of necessity reduces scattered facts to order and expresses results in a lucid and articulate way — such a mind is one of the greatest elements of success in this broad sort of teaching, and such a mind we credit you with possessing. But there are many other helps to breadth. You must give yourself to a wide range of reading. All history, all science, all master-pieces of human genius in painting and sculpture, in epic and tragic poetry, in eloquence and state-craft and invention, can help the interpretation of the word of God, — for these things help us to know man, man's thoughts, man's language, man's ways, — and, as man was made in the image of God, we may find in these things, as in a concave mirror, a faint and miniature reflection of the divine. But this is not enough. The mere book-worm cannot be a good interpreter. The teacher of the New Testament must be a full man, with social sympathies, in with the life of his times, knowing something by personal observation of its currents of opinion, mixing with cultivated people and getting stimulus from their talk, interesting himself, and so far as possible participating, in the political and the denominational movements of the day in which he lives. All this I say to you with the more emphasis, from the fact that you go to your work with no preliminary experience in the pastoral office and no great practice in preaching. Avail yourself of all opportunities to preach which you can use consistently with your main duty of teaching. Mingle with men. It will not hurt your work, but further it. It will give you illustrations for your class-room. It will put life and reality into your expositions of Paul and John.

I exhort you, in the third place, to *boldness*. Natural modesty is an admirable thing, — but when it becomes self depreciation and timidity it may hinder much good. I would have you bold in your thinking. Biblical interpreters have for ages followed one another like a flock of sheep. No one conversant with the commentaries, has failed to note how certain early and sometimes perverse opinions have repeated themselves, often in similar

forms of words, from generation to generation. It is a sort of visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, which should be a warning to us. There is such a thing as the *right* of private judgment, and most men recognize it. They do not so often recognize the *duty* of private judgment. It is particularly necessary that a teacher of exegesis should form in his pupils the habit of investigating and of deciding the meaning of the word of God for themselves. To stereotype certain traditional interpretations, and to transmit to posterity a number of lifeless copies of them, might have seemed a worthy work to the mediæval scholastic, but it ought not to seem a worthy work to us. But if the teacher is to make his pupils independent, he must be independent himself. He must come to the conclusion, with all proper humility, that with the help of the Holy Spirit, he has a right to his own opinion, and that, in a matter of interpretation, his opinion is as good as anybody's — at any rate is the only opinion which he can safely utter and act upon. It is a great epoch in one's history — and it is often marked by great struggle and prostration before God — when a teacher resolves that, come what will, he will follow the light he has, and will stand for what he thinks to be the truth. Then only, he begins to be a living force in the world of thought. Then only, his real powers begin to manifest themselves. If Christian teachers had always refused to say things, simply because others had said them, and had set themselves to publish the truth of Scripture as God made it known to them, the whole circle of theological sciences would have been lifted to a higher plane than that upon which they stand to-day, — and I venture to say that no seminary of our denomination would deprive its teachers of this independence. It is assumed that your general convictions are in harmony with those of the denomination and of the Seminary where you give instruction, and that, when they cease to be so, you will as an honest man resign your place. But this binds you to no narrow following of other men. You are to do independent work, as a teacher of God's word. And, if your conclusions should in any given case differ from those of your colleagues, you have the right to express your view, so long as you treat the opposing view with fairness and respect. It is not your main business to teach dogmatic theology, — but your department has intimate relations to dogmatic theology, and when you are asked in what direction any particular passage of Paul's epistles seems to tend, you have a right to state what are to your own mind its dogmatic implications. General uniformity of view in the Faculty of a Theological Seminary is indispensable. Division and party-spirit are fatal to its general influence. But absolute uniformity of thinking is impossible among differently constituted men; and, if it were possible, it would be a sure sign of intellectual stagnation, and of a mechanical sort of faith. Before your colleagues, then, as before your pupils, be yourself, and none other. Have a holy trust under God in your own powers, — you are set as a witness for God and you have the promise of his Spirit. Resolve nobly that you will strike out your own course. Let no man call you master. Let no man despise your youth. Find the lines upon which you can best lay out your strength. In those lines do your own thinking. And when you have by original and prayerful investigation reached results, utter them with energy of voice and manner; defend them against all comers; make your classes feel the mass and force of your own conviction;

stir them up by the vividness and insistence of your faith ; make them fight or surrender. A teacher who holds to nothing with earnestness may seem to succeed in his teaching,— but his success is due to the subject and not to the man. In the hands of a real teacher, even a subject of inferior moment seems dignified and important. My God help you, by the boldness of your teaching, to make the New Testament seem sublime.

But this leads me to the last of my suggestions. It is this : Be *reverent*. There is a fairy story that tells of a prince led to door after door of an enchanted castle, and finding inscribed over every door the words : "Be bold!" Animated by the apparent invitation, he tries each door successively, and it opens to his touch. But he comes at last to a door over which is written : "Be not too bold!" and to open that door is peril and death. So there is a limit to all human wisdom and power — a limit to the knowledge possible to man. There is a point where boldness should cease, even though it be the holy boldness of the saints, and we should fall on our faces before the majesty and authority of divine revelation. You will bear me witness, that all thought of a human reason that is the ultimate criterion or source of truth is foreign and abhorrent to me. In all that I have said with regard to thoroughness, breadth, boldness, as characteristics of true teaching in the department of theology which you are to cultivate, I have taken it for granted that you recognize the Bible as the word of God, inspired in every part, the only and infallible rule of faith and practice. Without such a sheet anchor as this faith in God's word furnishes, the thoroughness, breadth and boldness which I have inculcated would only be wind and steam and current to drive your vessel upon the rocks. And though I know that your faith is sound, let me formally and solemnly remind you that only absolute confidence in that word of God, and absorbing love for it as the eternal truth that is able to make us wise unto salvation, could justify you for a single moment in entering upon the great work to which you are called. Let me remind you that the man who interprets the Scriptures, and who studies them in a thorough way, has his peculiar dangers and temptations. He becomes acquainted with subtle objections and difficulties of which the ordinary Christian knows nothing. There are sprung upon him at times powerful and almost overwhelming assaults of scepticism. And often he can have no human helper — he must meet these attacks alone. At such times, if he be a merely professed, or a weak or sluggish, Christian, his faith, such as it is, may be undermined, honey-combed, annihilated. But if he be a strong Christian, full of love for God and for his word, his soul will be stirred within him ; the very ark of God's covenant will seem to be attacked ; he will be led to new discoveries of its impregnable defenses ; the result will be only new arguments for the Bible, and a more solid conviction of its everlasting truth. How tremendous are the interests at stake, when a teacher of teachers wavers in his faith and propagates his unbelief to others,— each student whom he instructs communicating the evil spirit to a thousand others, and they to other thousands, through the long succession of the years! To break one of Christ's least commandments and to teach men so, is to make ourselves the least in the kingdom of heaven. Where shall they be found, who seek to undermine the foundations of the kingdom of God on earth, by destroying the faith of God's elect?

My brother, I know that you realize your responsibility, and that you do not take to yourself this office of teaching the future ministers of Christ's churches. God has put it upon you, and I gladly commend you to him who qualifies every servant of his for his work. The only thing that can carry you through the arduous task before you, is the strength of the Lord Jesus Christ. Paul asked: "Who is sufficient for these things?" But he answered his own question: "Truly our sufficiency is from God, who hath made us able ministers of the New Testament." Such an able minister and teacher of the New Testament, may God make you to be! I pray that he will give you — I believe that he will give you — great joy and success in your work, and that he will make you, according to the measure of your powers, a means of enlarging the circle of Christian knowledge, of fitting his ministers for their sacred work, of drawing the church nearer to the heart of Christ, and of hastening the triumph of his kingdom in the world.

"And for the rest, in weariness,
In disappointment and distress,
When strength decays and hope grows dim,
We ever may recur to him
Who has the golden oil divine
Wherewith to feed our failing urns,—
Who watches every lamp that burns
Before his sacred shrine."

XXXI.

A GREAT TEACHER OF GREEK EXEGESIS.*

The hushed and intense silence of this funeral-scene is not without a meaning. We recognize by instinct the limits of the earthly, and standing upon its verge, we wait for some voice from beyond the darkness and the shadow. Human words are well, but now we listen for some word of God from the solemn quietudes and the eternal spaces into which our teacher and friend has vanished — some word that may tell us where and how the spirit fares that a few days since was with us, but now is not.

How fully this great need is met by Scripture! As we wait and listen, we too hear a voice from heaven, saying, "Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them." No interval of blank unconsciousness,—no doubt as to their felicity,—no interruption of their work for Christ. Activity, service,—these have not ceased. But labor, with its painfulness and sighing, its weakness and fear,—this has ceased, because, in the perfect union of the soul with its glorified Lord, all the imperfection and sin from which it springs have been done away forever. Into that rest of pure, rapturous and enlarged activity, the freed soul has entered.

And shall the long toil of the earthly life go for nothing, now that the soul is sundered from the body? Ah, no! The good men do is not "interred with their bones." It rises clear-voiced before God's throne. It witnesses to the reality and power of Christ's life in those who wrought it. "By their deeds shall they be justified," not because these furnish the ground of their acceptance and reward, but because these deeds make manifest to the universe the fact that "God was in them of a truth."

Nor shall these good deeds be lost on earth. "Their works shall follow them," even here. Embalmed in the memory of their children and of the church, they shall continue their influence of blessing, all the more precious and powerful for good now that the heart that prompted them is still and pulseless in the dust. And when the memory of their work shall fade on earth, and the last survivors of those who knew them shall be gathered to their fathers, God will not permit its fruits to die. No! no! There is a memory that never lets go that which is committed to it; there is a hand that never ceases to tend and water the seeds of its own planting; there is a divine pride and justice that never suffers the earthly work of his departed servants to go unfruitful or unrewarded. God takes up that work after the workers are dead, and carries it on. Through a thousand means of spoken

*An Address at the Funeral of Professor Horatio B. Hackett, D. D., in the Second Baptist Church, Rochester, November 5, 1875.

word or living example, the influence they have exerted multiplies as it goes down through the ages. The works of the righteous follow them, ever increasing in weight and power as they go onward, like the balls of moist snow which school-boys roll upon the ground in early winter, until, in the great day of account, those who did them are amazed at the surpassing grandeur of the result, and gazing at the vastness of the harvest which has sprung from the small seeds they sowed, they call to the Judge: "Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst,"—or did anything worthy of such abundant fruit!

It is only doing our part in fulfilling the declaration of Scripture, it is only performing a sacred duty to those who are left behind, when we speak to-day of the work and the character of a departed father and teacher in Israel. Far be it from us to glorify the name of man. The funeral-day is the day on which to recognize chiefly the sovereignty and grace of God. And he whose mortal remains lie before us, would have been the last to desire any other use of this occasion. We will not deal in eulogy. We give only a brief and simple memorial of one whose life and labors have become an inseparable part of the history of Biblical learning in America and in the world, and we do this, not for the praise of man, but for the glory of God's grace and for a testimony to those who come after.

With the second quarter of the present century, there commenced, both upon the Continent and in English-speaking lands, a reaction against the rationalism that had for so long a time poisoned and enfeebled the science of Scripture interpretation. Neander, Tholuck and Winer, in the several departments of history, exegesis and grammar, were showing the possibility of combining a scientific accuracy with a more evangelical faith,—nay, of delivering these special provinces of knowledge from the despoiling hands of a skeptical philosophy, by the very means of that believing spirit which the so-called philosophy despised. A new vitality and power was felt to pervade the Scriptures. New confidence was put in their accuracy of detail. The old apologies for Paul's slip-shod use of one Greek adjective or preposition, when he meant another, were shown to be wholly gratuitous. And upon the basis of a rigid and exhaustive grammatical and lexical analysis, the fair edifice of the nineteenth century exegesis and theology was built.

The new faith in Scripture and devotion to its study crossed the Atlantic, and found an impersonation in Moses Stuart of Andover. His incredible industry and contagious enthusiasm roused in this country a new love for Biblical studies. One of his pupils, however, who drank in, like a kindred spirit, his impassioned zeal for research and for teaching, went further than his master. Horatio B. Hackett betook himself to the German sources of knowledge, and above all to the New Testament original, felt himself compelled to adopt the Baptist faith as the result, and with an exacter scholarship than that of Stuart, made himself for a whole half-century, the Nestor and leader of Greek exegesis in a denomination, which, during that same period, grew from half the number, till it counted a million and three-quarters of souls. This, as it seems to us, was the significance of Dr. Hackett's position and work. Chase, and Conant, and Kendrick, were laboring with a like aim in related departments, but it was Dr. Hackett, who, more than any other man, formed the spirit and led the distinctive work of exact and

believing study of New Testament Greek in a great body of Christians, which, partly by reason of this same progress in knowledge and love of the word of God, raised themselves during his life-time from numerical weakness to numerical power. He taught the teachers of hundreds of thousands of Christians throughout the land. And though many threads of human influence are woven together in the fabric of our denominational progress, we are safe in saying that our position in intelligence and influence to-day is in large part the result of the life and work of Horatio B. Hackett.

But the influence of his work extended beyond the bounds of our denomination, even as his sympathies and aims were broadly Christian, rather than sectarian. One of the most thorough scholars and one of the ablest men of the Congregational body said to me some years ago, that he regarded Dr. Hackett as the best Biblical scholar that wrote in the English language. A recent English work upon the Acts of the Apostles mentions Dr. Hackett's Commentary as the best work accessible to the English student. Dr. Westcott, the noted English writer upon the canon of the New Testament, said recently in a private letter, that he had discarded the English edition of the Bible Dictionary in order to replace it by Dr. Hackett's. In Germany, also, his works have been quoted and commended by scholars of the highest rank, and by many of these scholars Dr. Hackett was reckoned as a correspondent and friend. No man could hold a place like this, without influencing the Christian thought of the age, and by just so much as the progress of the church is dependent upon correct understanding of the Scriptures, by just so much must the work of our departed friend be regarded as having intimate connections with the general power of the universal church of Christ in this last generation of the history of the world.

This is much to say of the life and work of a scholar whom the outside world knows almost nothing of. But it is the Christian estimate. It takes account of God's ordination of conspiring influences, and his weaving the thread of his servant's life into the life of the church and of the time. Providentially and by his own deliberate purpose he was fitted for his work. What were the characteristics of the teacher and the man, that gave him his place and his influence? I say the teacher and the man,— but the two were one and inseparable. Of few men can it be said, with equal truth, that all there was of faculty and energy, even to the uttermost fancy and feeling, was thrown into the work appointed him. With him there was no side-life, no dallying with minor interests. That face so grave, benignant, just — that form so proportioned, compact, true — showed, even in the most casual conversation, no signs of trifling. "One thing I do," seemed written out in the very intent composure of the man. He was buried in his work of studying and interpreting the word of God. And to many and many a student, that example of a high intellect, that bent itself with ever new avidity and delight to exploration of the treasures of the Bible, has given a new and inextinguishable sense of the infinite reaches and the priceless value of God's revelation.

He might have had this singleness of aim without being the teacher that he was. But he added to this, certain teacherly qualifications which must not be unspoken of to-day; and, first of all, the discipline and the habit of exhaustive investigation. Sometime a man must gain this, or he never makes

a scholar. And one of the great blessings of God to a student, is the sight and contact of a teacher who presents in himself a model of absolute thoroughness; who anatomises his subject — brain, skeleton, viscera and heart; who, like Sir William Hamilton, aims before writing to master every valuable word that has been written upon his theme since the world began; who candidly recognizes every difficulty and weighs every objection; who leaves no stone unturned, if he may find, perchance, some new illustration that will help to clear or impress what he conceives after long toil and inquiry to be the truth. Such a man was the instructor whom we knew. He had drunk in Greek in his very early boyhood; he had made it a living tongue to him by teaching its classics at Amherst and Providence, and by talking it with the boatmen of the Piræus and the shop-keepers of Athens; the rhythm and grace of it had entered into his brain and blood. Travel had made the scenes of Scripture vivid realities to him; he could interpret the ninetieth Psalm from his own experience in the solitudes of the desert, and the triumphal entry of Jesus, in Matthew, from his own surprise and exultation as he rounded the edge of Olivet, and caught the glorious view of Jerusalem, once the holy, now the profaned and desolate city. German, he learned in Germany itself; and the great works of the German critical scholarship, he daily used more constantly and naturally than English. But these were only the preparations for his work. Elaborate and comprehensive review of all the important literature bearing upon the subject under investigation, was followed by cautious, prolonged and original thought, and in this, the penetrating mind, the suspended judgment, the final, clear decision, showed him the master.

This was the spirit which he strove to arouse within his pupils — the spirit of minute, critical, exhaustive Scripture study. *Non multa, sed multum.* Not to go over all Scripture in a year, but to teach men what it was to study a few passages well; to convince them that every phrase had a meaning, definite and single — a meaning that could be accurately ascertained and clearly expressed according to fixed and settled laws of human speech; above all, that every word of God had a meaning which was worth all the study that the best-trained mind could put upon it,— this was his one great lesson to successive companies of students for forty years. If this had been the book-wormish and exaggerated devotion of a life-time to trifles like the markings of diatoms, it would have merited little praise. But it had its foundation and explanation in a reverent regard for divine revelation, that on the one hand would not brook a mystical importation of human fancies into the sacred text, and on the other hand would not permit the smallest Greek article or conjunction to be treated as an idle or ambiguous thing, in that word which "holy men of old wrote, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Exegetical science has made steady progress since Dr. Hackett began to teach. The old mystical and homiletical method that prevailed in England fifty years ago, contemporaneously with the rationalistic methods of Germany, has given place to a more thoughtful and just inquiry into the actual meaning of Scripture. The grammatical and lexical method which succeeded, and the possibilities of which our departed friend so nobly illustrated, has itself been modified and broadened by Godet and Philippi, by Lightfoot and Perowne. We seem just about to enter upon a new era of Scripture

comment, in which the word of God is to be interpreted not as a congeries of parts, but as an organic whole with a living unity. But historical and doctrinal interpretation, which Dr. Hackett conceived to belong not so much to his department as to that of theology, presupposes the grammatical and lexical, and would be impossible but for just such work as Dr. Hackett did. How faithful to that work he was, may be inferred from the fact that, after forty years of teaching, he never went to his class without a new investigation and revision of the lesson for the hour.

One other most distinguishing characteristic of his, was his faculty of terse, vivid and eloquent exposition. He knew something of the heights and depths of the English language, and he never failed to use it, even in his unpremeditated talk, with a curious accuracy and a delicate sense of light and shade, that invested even the commonest subjects with a charm, and left in many hearers' minds the feeling of an untraversable chasm between his culture and their own, while it stimulated the discerning to new care of their common speech. Yet this was at a world-wide remove from all pedantry or affectation. It was the limpid bubbling of a fountain of sweet waters, that all unconscious of itself must flow, and purely flow, if it flow at all. In his early days, he had drunk deep at those old "wells of English undefiled," that are so nearly deserted now. His keen critical mind detected and rejected, with almost chemical alertness, both the vague and the rude in expression. He knew the value of time, and had learned the secret of style. He cultivated brevity and vigor of statement, in order to economize attention, and get the most that was possible into the written paragraph or into the passing hour. His questioning, in the class-room, was sharp and rapid, and perfectly unambiguous. And when he soared, as he often did, it was as if the prophetic fire of the sacred writer he expounded had flashed into his own breast, and he himself were caught up in spirit. It was no rhapsody or long drawn digression that he indulged in, but a powerful picturing of the scene or the circumstances or the thought or the emotion, of evangelist or apostle, in the composition of the very words under consideration. No man has lived, in America at least, who has been able so vividly to impress the most minute and recondite indications of the Greek original upon the minds of New Testament students. Again and again have his classes found themselves gazing at him with open mouths — lost themselves and he lost also — in intense contemplation of the truth wrapped up in some Greek particle and now for the first time unfolded before them. The piece of fire-works unlighted, and the piece of fire-works burning, are no more different, than Dr. Hackett in his quiet moods, and Dr. Hackett kindled and glowing in his exposition of the Scripture.

During the war, it became his duty to give the parting address to the graduating class at Newton. They were going forth in a time of great needs and of great examples. In the silence of his study Dr. Hackett had followed our armies, and his whole soul was with the brave men struggling, wounded, dying, in the field. He urged the graduates to be men of like devotion to the cause of God. And, as he spoke, one of his raptures of eloquence came upon him, and the whole assembly were swept and bowed by his intense and flaming appeals. A man possessed of such godlike faculty of speech, and using it every day for two score of years to awaken enthusiasm in the

study of the original Scriptures, is a very gift of God to those who hear him. He has stimulated many an apathetic soul into thought, and though he would have called himself no orator, many and many a man has caught the spirit of true pulpit oratory from him.

When I add to these two a last characteristic, I feel that it is the crown of all,—I mean his "modest stillness and humility." A natural shrinking from publicity, a constant consciousness of his imperfections, a childlike casting of himself at the feet of Christ, his Savior — these were so marked that they prevented most people from knowing him at all, while those who did know him knew him in these aspects best. His own low appreciation of his work led him to regard almost as pleasantry the praise that sometimes was lavished on him. At other times, his friends feared to intrude even their gratitude upon a mind that seemed so far from the thought of self. He was always ready to confess ignorance. Sometimes he timidly confessed it, when he knew far more upon the subject in question, than the person who offered to inform him. With a peculiarly nervous temperament, that made him exceedingly sensitive to interruption, and an absorption of mind in his proper work, that left but little time to think of matters of common life, he was sometimes perplexed and ruffled, but he was just as sensitive to kindness, and there were times when he showed the very tenderness of a woman. How utterly devoid of ostentation or forth-putting or self-seeking he was! With gifts that made him at times a very prince of talkers, it was only at intervals of years that he could be induced to speak in public. He prayed at our Chapel-service, and his pupils gained new views of sin, when they heard Dr. Hackett humbling himself and taking upon his lips the words of the publican: "God be merciful to me, the sinner." They gained new views of Christian service, when they heard him laying all his work as an unworthy offering at the feet of Him who died for us. Dear whitened head! how many lessons it has taught us of unselfishness and humility. Thank God, he knows now, that his labor and his life were "not in vain in the Lord."

Only this last summer he visited his old haunts in Germany, and revived some of his cherished acquaintances of former days. He talked with Müller and Tholuck. He brought back the scissors and the paper-weight last used by Meyer, and presented to him by his daughter-in-law. The companionship of an old friend made the journey delightful. He returned to his work possessed apparently of a new vitality and spirit. On the very morning that he died, he prayed in his family, that, if it were God's will, the members of it might be long spared to each other. But God's ways are not our ways. Three days ago he met his class in the lecture-room, but a sudden pain seized him, and he suspended the exercise. He walked to his home, and there, in his own bed, in a short half-hour, he breathed his life away, so softly, that those who stood by hardly knew when he was gone. It was dying without the long agony of sickness. Unconscious as he was, it was virtually an instant transportation from the world of anxious desire, and, at the best, of unsatisfied hopes, to the joy of his Lord, and the untroubled rest and inconceivable reward of the faithful. It was sudden death, but it was sudden glory.

With the family toward whom he cherished so tender an affection, with

the members of this Institution who so loved him, with the great company of ministers and scholars throughout the land who revered him as a teacher and a father, there is mourning to-day. From the East many friends of olden time have sent their letters of condolence, and from the distant state of Indiana, the Convention of Baptists there assembled unite in a telegraphic expression of sympathy. We have few such men to lose. But let us not murmur, nor mourn as those who are without hope. God's purpose and wisdom are in this affliction,—his will be done! God has blessed the earth with his life,—let us be thankful! God will care for his family, and for the Institution to which he gave his last labors,—let us trust those infinite resources of power and grace that for a little time gave him to us! Nothing in this world is too good to die; earthly friends and teachers and leaders fall; but the glorious gospel lives, and Christ lives, to put all things, even death itself, under his feet. Ah! the revelation is better still, for Christ himself has said to us, "I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die." Let us not then talk of death,—it is life into which our beloved friend has entered. And since life to him meant work, I cannot think of him as enjoying or as praising only. That intent and studious mind is surely busy somewhere. He did good work for God here,—but he will do better work for God there, as he uses his now ransomed powers perfectly and only for the glory of his Redeemer. And so we lay these palm-branches upon his coffin, with the floral cross and crown. They are poor and mute, yet true testimonies, of our unending affection and remembrance. But they are more. They are symbols of the cross in which he trusted and of the joy to which the cross has led him,—the kingly diadem and the victor's palm!

XXXII.

CHURCH HISTORY, AND ONE WHO TAUGHT IT.*

In the earliest days of the church, there was one who, more than any other human teacher mentioned in sacred writ, had discovered the connection and meaning of the great events of Israelitish history. He had come to look upon the present as well as upon the past as having lasting significance only by virtue of its relations to the divine-human person and work of Jesus Christ, and to the new spiritual life transfused from him into the veins of an exhausted and degenerate humanity, at the cost of the shedding of his blood. Only after Christ had come, was there possible a philosophy of history, and the first philosopher of history was Stephen. Yet the life of Stephen ended before it had well begun. His magnificent historical survey of the ages before Christ kindled the anger of that hostile Jewish tribunal; by sudden and unexpected death, he was taken from the world while the work he seemed specially fitted to accomplish was just entered upon and only done as it were by fragment and sample; this mournful record closes with words so vivid and affecting that the grief of eighteen centuries ago seems still to live and throb and break before us into convulsive weeping: "And devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him."

In memory of a teacher of Church History, of a true man, and of a true Christian, we who were honored in being his colleagues and friends desire to utter a few simple words to-day, and so to testify and represent the common grief of this whole company of learned and devout men who carry him to his burial. Though it is forbidden me by the exigencies of the occasion, and the mention of his personal qualities has been assigned to another, I find it hard to forbear all reference to these, for he was the kindest and most gracious soul I ever knew. He was also a Christian man and a member of the Christian body, whose unsparing faithfulness and self-devotion left no heard call of duty unanswered. But this falls to his pastor to say. To me it is appointed simply to speak of him as regards the work to which he had deliberately chosen to devote his life,— the work of investigation and of instruction in church history. As preliminary and essential to a proper estimate of this, I shall speak with great brevity of his parentage, education and general preparation for his calling. I shall then describe his ideal of that calling, and the extent to which he realised it.

Rabbi Joseph Wales Buckland was born at Deerfield, Oneida county, N. Y., on the 16th of December, 1829, so that his life covers a period of only forty-seven years. His father was a minister of the gospel of the Baptist

*An Address at the Funeral of Professor R. J. W. Buckland, D. D., at the Second Baptist Church, Rochester, February 1, 1877.

denomination. His mother, like Hannah and Elizabeth of old, believed before his birth that God was to give her a son who should serve him in the sacred ministry. During his infancy and early childhood this impression became conviction in the minds of both of the parents, and, in token of their faith in God and of their consecration of the child to this service, they changed the name, which originally was Smith, and had been given in remembrance of a young man who had studied for the ministry with the father but had met an early death, to Rabbi. That name, so nearly unheard of, was to be significant, as Hebrew names of old times were, and as modern names are not. It was to remind the boy as he grew—it was to remind the parents in their training of him—that he was to be a teacher for God. Never did name serve its purpose better than this one. Within this last year he has mentioned it as one of the influences of childhood and youth, that shaped his career in life. Although both parents carefully avoided speaking to him of the ministry until God had led him to choose it of his own accord, he considered his possession of this name as one of the providential circumstances which determined him to preach the gospel.

Mr. Buckland's conversion was such as might have been expected in the case of one who was brought up under the peculiar religious influences which surrounded his early life. His mother was a woman superior in Christian devotion and attainments, so that I may say I have known but one other person at all comparable with her in this respect. The Bible was her constant theme, and Mr. Buckland has told me it was thought that more than one revival of religion in the churches where his father preached had been the result of her prayers and labors. So great was Mr. Buckland's devotion to his mother that I believe he never omitted making what I called his yearly pilgrimage to the old homestead, so long as her life and that of his father was spared. During these visits, his mother would gather passage after passage of the Scriptures, which she seemed to have hoarded up through the year, and ply him with questions as to the interpretation of them. Laughingly he would retort and call upon her for her own interpretation of these and other difficult passages, but so constant and so careful was her study of the Bible, that no minister of the gospel could have been more ready with an intelligent interpretation than she. His father's conversations were very similar to those of his mother. The subjects I have mentioned were the all-absorbing ones in the case of each. From these facts one may well judge that there would naturally be nothing sudden or striking in the conversion of one brought up under the influence of such parents, so that Mr. Buckland said he could not date the particular time when he passed from darkness to light, but that it was a gradual change. I think his parents had never urged him to study for the ministry, and I think he was not aware, unless from inference, that his mother had had the impressions concerning him of which I have just spoken.

At the age of seventeen, young Buckland entered the Sophomore class of Union College, and though among the youngest, if not the youngest of his class, he graduated at its head. After he had left college, he taught for more than a year in an institution for the blind in New York City. Even thus early he had formed a taste for natural science. Botany was one of the subjects he taught within the year or two that followed. He gave instruc-

tion in certain noted female seminaries in the metropolis, and with such marked success, that subsequent propositions looking toward his acceptance of the position of President of one of the great colleges for women, were probably based in part upon the tradition of it. Through all these years of teaching and through all the years of his subsequent preaching, his taste for natural science grew. The microscope was his recreation; natural history was his delight. He became an active member of several of the important scientific Societies of New York.

There is an intimate connection and analogy between natural history and history properly so-called. Both give accounts of organic and living things. Growth and development are the essential principles of both. How it was that our friend was led to connect historical studies with his studies in natural history, we do not know. It is certain that the latter greatly assisted the former; it may be that the one led to the other, as to a cognate field of inquiry. But there was another relationship of friendship and sympathy which must have had greater influence still. Young Buckland entered the congregation of Dr. William R. Williams, pastor of the Amity street church, — justly celebrated wherever the Baptist name is known as a princely preacher and as a man of wide historical erudition. The friendship of such a man, with the access he enjoyed to Dr. Williams's large private library, if it did not originate, did much to fix his taste for history and to guide his subsequent studies. Under the influence of Dr. Williams's preaching, he was converted. He was baptized, and was recommended to study for the ministry. He pursued a course of theology at Union Theological Seminary, graduating in 1855. He was ordained as pastor of the Olive Branch Baptist Church, on Madison Street, New York City. After a year of service in this first pastorate, he took charge of the church in Sing Sing. Here he spent seven years, from 1857 to 1864. He then returned to New York, and for five years was pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church on Twenty-third Street, one of the large and influential churches of the metropolis. Through all these thirteen years of ministerial labor, he showed himself the instructive preacher, the faithful pastor, the unfailing friend. Members of these churches have given me testimony within the few months past to the admiration and love with which they cherished the memory of his ministrations.

But his studies and natural tastes fitted him better for teaching than for the work of the pastorate. History and science had gone hand in hand and had led him onward. He had made original investigations into the history of our own denomination, or of bodies professing a similar faith to ours, for a considerable period before and after the time of the Reformation. He had been elected member of the Historical Society of New York. Certain lectures of his upon historical themes had attracted attention. The chair of History in this Seminary was vacant. None was thought so fit as he to fill it. He came to Rochester in 1869, and began his work. To that work he gave himself with all the abandon and delight of a boy let loose in fragrant fields, after the hard tasks of school. Laboring always till midnight — often long after midnight — in exhausting preparation for the lecture of the coming day, and that, not for one week but for every week of the thirty-five included in the annual term of study, and adding to this the almost constant supply of some important pulpit of the city, he yet had such joy and excitement

in his work that he seemed to gain strength rather than to lose. And this unremitting labor, never lightened by the declination of calls to work of other sorts that were constantly pressed upon him, he kept up almost to the end. His even temperament and his iron constitution seemed equal to any strain. Few suspected that he could overdo. He was occasionally warned that no system could endure so constant taxing, but he confidently replied that he could work more hours in the day, and more days in the week, and more weeks in the year, than any man he ever knew. It was true,—but there is a limit to all human strength. Two years ago he broke, under the tension. Organic disease manifested itself, and though disease was never fought against with greater energy of will, disease has triumphed, and his work on earth is done. This leads me to speak of his ideal of the work of the teacher of Church History, and of the measure of his attainment. I do it, as one might estimate the height of a hill which he had never climbed. It is evident that no man can achieve high success as a teacher in any department, who has not a lofty sense of the dignity of his work and of his own personal vocation thereto. In this respect, Dr. Buckland did not fall below the highest standard. To him Church History was not only a science and the most comprehensive of sciences — it was also the most important of all the sciences. He felt called of God to teach it. He was to continue, though uninspired, the history of the kingdom of God which an inspired Moses and an inspired Luke began. He felt that knowledge of the progress of this kingdom and of the conflicts through which it had passed, was essential to to the equipment of every competent preacher of the gospel. And he was set to give this knowledge to a portion of the rising ministry. He declined, in 1871, without a moment's hesitation, a call to the Presidency of Shurtleff College, and declined it upon the ground that the teaching of history was the one work and duty of his life. In his sickness, he could not be convinced that his work was done. He felt, through all the twenty-four months of his weakness and pain, that he was bound by the terms of his original calling to daily and hourly struggle with the powers that would terminate or curtail the great work to which he had devoted himself.

It is indispensable that the true teacher have a lofty idea of the dignity and importance of his work. It is yet more essential that we have a correct idea of its nature. No man can teach history who conceives of it as a record of isolated facts. Unless he can see, in the epoch, in the nation, in the society, the product and expression of internal ideas and forces, which evolve themselves according to constituted law, he can understand neither society, nor nation, nor epoch. The life of states is a dynamic unfolding of a substantive, though spiritual, principle inlaid in the character of their people. Until man is bound to his fellows by some such principle, so that together they can act as one body, he has no history, nor has he risen from savagery. Where there is any degree of civilization, there are no sudden movements, no changes without cause, no revolutions without age-long preparation. History is no rope of sand, but an organic whole ; and that which furnishes the chief connecting bond and the most powerful motive-force of history is the religious idea. Let me not go further, without assuring you that this view of the nature of history, with all its grand implications, is not simply mine — it was the guiding principle of Dr. Buckland's studies and teaching.

From notes of his own lectures, I have gained, since he died, a larger conception than otherwise would have been possible of the breadth of his intended treatment of history. As he held the religious idea to be the chief force, so he held the theanthropic life of Christ to be the centre and pivot around which all history groups itself. "The whole career of mankind"— these are his words—"the whole career of mankind, considered in its relation to that theanthropic life, is sacred history; the whole life of the world, treated without reference to that, is secular history." The history of the church is the history of the unfolding of this new divine life which, entering the world in Christ, is ever communicating itself, not without conflict and temporary hindrance through human perversity, to ever-widening circles of humanity. Every phase and step of this history is to be examined and tested and judged, according as the church therein is faithful to the laws laid down in the New Testament for its development. I know of no sublimer conception of Church History than this. It is Neander's, with the test of subjective consciousness left out, and the test of Scripture alone retained.

Such was his idea of his work, as to its importance and its nature. But conception is one thing, execution quite another. To execute a task like that to which he set himself, there goes the power of original and exhaustive investigation. Generalizations must be based upon wide induction of facts, and the gathering of these facts from languages ancient and modern, and from sources as common as the daily newspaper, and as recondite as the stray minutes of ecclesiastical bodies that met in obscure towns of England two hundred years ago, involves a linguistic training, an untiring industry, a generous comprehensiveness of spirit, a critical acumen in selecting and in rejecting material, which are rarely combined. Dr. Buckland had these, all in some degree, some in large degree. I have spoken of his industry. The comprehensiveness of his inquiries was as remarkable as his industry. Nothing was too great, nothing too small, that bore upon his theme. The life of Christ seemed to him to be the beginning of church history, as indeed it was,—he embraced that in his treatment. The heathen religions seemed to him a preparation for Christ,—he made them the subject of preliminary lectures. He wished to extend his course by embracing the history of Israel from the beginning to the coming of Christ. He brought down the history of the church to the present time. It is my judgment that as a whole, his treatment of the history of modern denominations was more thorough and exhaustive than that of any teacher of our day; of certain of them he has given a fuller and better account than can be found in the works of their own writers. With his omnivorous avidity for facts, we used to say to him in pleasantry that he never would be satisfied till he had in his lectures carefully traced Church History back all the way from twelve o'clock to-day to the formation of the solar system according to the nebular hypothesis. And what he learned he remembered, whether it was matter of history, or of the natural science and civil law which he had looked into for purposes of recreation or illustration. An admiring friend, not given to random judgments, a member at once of the legal profession and of a club of gentlemen of scientific tastes to which Dr. Buckland belonged, said upon a certain occasion, that whatever subject might be treated by members of the club, whether it were politics, science, law, or religion, Dr. Buckland always

seemed to know more about the subject than the man who had specially investigated it. There was perhaps something of designed hyperbole in the utterance, but it expresses in some degree the estimate formed by competent judges with regard to the extent and range of his learning.

The proper execution of a historian's task requires a philosophical mind. I have said that Dr. Buckland set out at the very beginning of his work with a correct idea of the nature of history. He gathered an immense mass of material of the most valuable kind. He felt that the organizing of this material, with the insight into principles that seizes upon salient facts and avoids superabundance of detail, was a work, not of days or months, but of long and laborious years. He had given his life to this work,— with physical vigor such as few possess, he expected a lifetime to do it in. His full set of written lectures would fill two thousand printed octavo pages. He had already done much in the way of condensing and systematizing this material. The syllabus of his lectures which he printed for the use of students, shows a consistent plan, a grasp of materials, a grouping and unifying mind, which gave high promise of what our friend might have done had God lengthened out his life. As it is, he had one thread running through all his lectures. No student who sat under his instruction will ever forget his idea of the church and of its development. His friends, in no small number, had looked upon him as the future writer of that history of the Church of Christ from a Baptist point of view, which has so long been a desideratum in our denomination, and which we might reasonably hope would be of value to Christians of other names. But a Providence wiser than ours has ordered that the work shall be left incomplete. Much is fragmentary, which unquestionably would have been filled out and brought into vital relation to the rest, had time and strength served him. He thought he could not die until that work was done. Ah, how small is our best work, and how unessential our life, to the purposes of him whose life-time is eternity and whose resources are infinite ! But God, we doubt not, took the will for the deed, and as for us — why, the torso is noble, though much is lacking to the perfect form. From what he has done, we may conjecture how much there would have been of true philosophy in his matured and finished work.

There is a true sense in which his work is not yet done. Through the many students whom he had helped to train for the ministry, his life perpetuates itself. And this is the last and crucial test of an instructor in Church History; does he impress himself upon his classes? does he make true ideas of history a part of them forever? I think we cannot doubt that this was so with regard to Dr. Buckland. He had a natural ardor of mind and a gentle dignity, an unfailing flow of speech and a readiness to further in every possible way the inquiries of his pupils, which together made him impressive and popular, in spite of that severest trial of patience and attention, the manual labor of long copying from dictation. The student loved the man and his work,—and it is the man, in large part, that makes the teacher. Subjects for public essays, where the student had his option, have been taken from Church History as frequently, if not more frequently, than from any other department of theological knowledge. He has left behind him no printed and published work, but he has written many "living epistles" that have gone forth, as we trust, to teach and to bless the church

and the world. And now that he has gone from us to pursue the themes he loved with a clearer insight and a wider knowledge than that of earth, now that he watches the progress of the kingdom of God, not as one who is himself in the din and smoke of the battle, but from a point above the strife where the complicated movements of the combatants are seen in their true meaning and the chariots of God are discerned filling the mountains round about his people, shall we doubt in our loss and sorrow, that he who gave him to us will choose and point out one to take his mantle and complete his work? Let us pray God that out of the number of those he taught, there may be found one who shall accept the truth and be filled with a double portion of his spirit. When devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him, they little knew that Stephen's words had already gone to the heart of one named Saul, and that those words would never leave him, until Saul had become Paul, and the great teacher of the Gentiles had appeared to carry on the work which Stephen left so incomplete. But whatever may befall, this we know, that parting and death, disappointment and disaster, all changes and all times, all we do and all we leave undone, is made to further the historic progress and the ultimate triumph of the kingdom of our God.

XXXIII.

LEARNING IN THE PROFESSOR'S CHAIR.*

I have been asked to say a few words with regard to Dr. Hotchkiss as a teacher, and with regard to his former connection with the Rochester Theological Seminary. I little thought twenty-five years ago when, as a student of the Institution, I first came under his instruction, that the day would ever come that I, as a representative of the Seminary, should officiate at his funeral. Even now the old associations come over me, and it seems unfit that I, the scholar, should speak of him the teacher. But there is a debt of gratitude I owe him, and though I can but poorly repay it by any spoken words, yet such as I have I gladly give, by way of tribute to an old instructor, whom each successive year has only taught me the more to revere and to love.

I shall be obliged to say over again some things which the honored President of the University has said before me, because what Dr. Hotchkiss was as a teacher grew out of what he was as a scholar, as a preacher, and as a man. Technical learning alone can never make a successful instructor of the young. There must be with it, and behind it, a certain mass of manhood, or the learning will never win respect, much less communicate itself, as by contagion, to the pupils. There was much in the mental make-up of our friend, which qualified him for success in the professor's chair, and especially for success in his chosen department — the teaching of the Bible in the original languages. He was an ardent lover of the Bible, and a profound believer that its every line and syllable were written by holy men of old as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. In those days, we who were students wondered whether he did not press too strongly and exclusively the divine aspect of the doctrine of inspiration, and whether he made sufficient allowance for the human moulds into which the molten gold of truth has been poured. But it was a most valuable and never to be forgotten lesson which we learned from his intense and unflinching maintenance of the divinity of the Bible. To him each and every part of it was instinct with life. There was meaning enough in every word, to spend an hour upon. And every word had its practical value, because it was a part of the larger word of God.

I think that all his learning grew out of this reverence for the Scriptures. His studies were not secular studies. He did not give himself to Syriac and Arabic merely because he loved *them*, but because he could make them helps to the interpretation of the Bible. He was an illustration of the intellectual stimulus and achievement which come directly and indirectly from the gos-

* Remarks at the Funeral of the Rev. V. R. Hotchkiss, D. D., in the First Baptist Church, Rochester, January 7, 1882.

pel of Christ. He loved the old doctrines, and he held them in their old forms. The fall and total depravity of man, the substitutionary atonement of a divine Savior, the sovereign grace of God in regeneration, the eternal doom of those who reject Christ — these were to him indubitable truths, because the Bible taught them. And though his mind did not run predominantly to Systematic Theology, yet a clearly conceived, and at times a sharply stated, theology gave coherence to all his thinking, and strength to all his utterances as a teacher.

Because he recognized the Bible as the only infallible and sufficient source of truth with regard to God and heaven, sin and redemption, he set himself from the beginning of his ministry to draw water out of these wells of salvation. He knew that the well was deep, and so he availed himself of all grammatical, lexical and exegetical helps. He became a genuine man of learning. I doubt whether any man in the pastorate of any denomination in the land pursued a more continuous and thorough course of Biblical study than he. And in our own denomination, I can safely say that, though some may have surpassed him in their knowledge of history, of philosophy, or of theology proper, we have had no man in the pastorate who was a more profound student of the Scriptures. I do not speak simply of his knowledge of the Greek, of the Hebrew with its cognate languages, of oriental archæology and customs, geography and history. I mean that knowledge which is the result of painstaking and minute investigation of every verse and chapter and book of the sacred record — such investigation as is necessary to correct and effective exposition of the Bible in public.

In teaching his classes, therefore, he was always felt to be a full man. He would bring out meanings which we students had never imagined before, but the truth of which, when once suggested, was self-evidencing. Truly I can say, that the hours spent in his lecture-room were pleasant hours. He formed in us the habit of searching the Scriptures ; showed us what mines of unsuspected wealth were in them ; and withal taught us, after all our grammatical and textual studies, how to take forth the precious from the vile, and to turn every real acquisition to practical use. In this respect I must speak of his Sabbath sermons, as an unintended but most helpful means of influence over his students. He had a rare way of gathering up the results of a week's study of a miracle or of a parable, of a connected passage of prophecy or of a penitential Psalm of David, into a compact, well-organized and intensely interesting expository discourse. I doubt whether this country has seen a better expository preacher than he was at his best. I remember going out from the meeting-house after his sermon on the Transfiguration, almost carried beyond myself by the variety of new knowledge, the grandeur of description, and the wealth of practical application he had given us from that well-worn narrative. Many an earnest effort to study the Scriptures with thoroughness, and many an attempt, however imperfect, to follow in his line of expository preaching, were, in my own case and in the case of others, the result of his example.

He had doubtless his limitations. He was not — no man can be — equally conversant with all departments of knowledge. But Dr. Hotchkiss came as near knowing something about everything, and everything about something, as any man I have met. He was not preëminently a philosopher,— but he

could talk with you about Kant and Hamilton. He was not mainly a student of the Fathers,—but he could give you new information about Hegesippus and Origen. He was not given to political economy,—but he could argue the question of protection and free trade. He was not a devotee of Early English,—but he had read Piers Plowman, and he knew his Chaucer. He was not a recluse. He was a sagacious observer of current events. He was a companion almost unequalled in his power to instruct and entertain. Nervous of temperament, easily disturbed on account of this physical peculiarity, he was yet, with friends, one of the most genial of men. The Minister's Conference, of Buffalo, have given expression to their sense of bereavement, in the loss of one who was their wisest counsellor, their most erudite scholar, and their most venerated and beloved friend.

All these peculiarities made his instruction of his classes something unique. His quick, nervous manner, the readiness with which emotion would master the voice, the sharpness with which he would reprove captious questioning, the genuine devotion to the sacred text which shone through all his utterances—these first challenged attention, then attracted interest, finally won sympathy and confidence, till his classes came to be fellow-students with him, or rather, like a family group—he the father, and they the children sitting at his feet to learn. For eleven years he did this work in the Seminary, and, when it ceased in 1865, scores of Baptist ministers were preaching, and have been preaching ever since, with something of the matter he had given them, and with something of the spirit they had caught from him.

If there was anything he loved next to the Bible, it was the Bible-lands. I never can forget the ardor with which he would expatiate upon the scenes of Palestine and of the Desert. Twice he went to the East, and five times he traversed the Holy Land from end to end. To hear him tell about the red cliffs of Sinai, or about Jacob's well, where Jesus taught the woman of Samaria, or about Jerusalem, "beautiful for situation, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King," was almost to see the sights yourself. To see those sights he traveled, in the fall of the year, with a single Arab guide, under circumstances that involved no little hardship. But it was the delight of his life. And now that he is gone, I think with pleasure, and I know that his children and his friends will think with pleasure, that he has entered the gates of that city that hath foundations, the heavenly Jerusalem, and has become an inhabitant forever of that Holy Land of which the earthly is but the faint type and symbol,—

> "A land upon whose blissful shore
> There falls no shadow, rests no stain;
> There those who meet shall part no more,
> And those long parted meet again."

There the deep meanings of the book of God are opened to his illumined sight, and Christ speaks to him no more in parables, but shows him plainly of the Father. We do not need to pray for the repose of his soul, for the perfect peace of Christ is now his. He has served his generation by the will of God, and now he rests from his labors, and his works do follow him.

XXXIV.

THE DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT.*

It was the old story of a suppressed rebellion planting its last revengeful sting. Abner, the captain of Saul's host had been beaten in battle and had taken to flight. Three brothers from the army of Israel had pursued him. As Asahel, the fleetest of them, without armor, pressed upon him, Abner smote him with his spear. Asahel's very strength and swiftness and noble daring had brought him to his death. The enemies of David and of stable government gave the good cause a temporary check by striking down one of its most hopeful champions. It was no wonder that all the people that saw that bloody deed, or looked upon the mangled corpse of the brave soldier, were so moved with grief and indignation that they stood still.

Twice, in like manner, this whole nation has stood still over the bodies of its chosen and beloved chief-magistrates, smitten in the hour of greatest fame and promise, and smitten by the hand of the assassin. Once when Abraham Lincoln,—the great civil war concluded, emancipation an accomplished fact, the whole North full of gratitude and reverence for the sturdiness of that homely, humane trust in the people and in God that had led him safely through,—fell a martyr to liberty. How well I remember looking down from a window in Broadway upon that mighty funeral procession stretching up and down as far as the eye could reach, the muffled drums and the draperies of woe with which our great War-President was carried through the country to his tomb. But sadder yet, seemed to me the other night those mournful bells that waked us only to tell that the brave spirit of our last President had passed forever from the world. Lincoln's work seemed to have been accomplished. The whole land wept for him as for a benefactor. Garfield had just entered upon his term of service, and his work as President had just begun. As with Asahel in the Scripture narrative, a thousand hopes lie buried with him—hopes that held on in spite of disappointment, hopes fostered by the quiet courage of the long struggle against death, hopes based upon the new independence and influence which this very agony and trial would have given him. When I heard the tolling of those midnight bells, it seemed to me like a voice of God calling the nation to solemn thought and prayer. Now, if never before, we may hear what God the Lord will speak. Surely it becomes us, like the Israelites of old, in the presence of our dead, to stand still.

First of all, we may stand still in appreciative remembrance of the life

* A Sermon on the death of President Garfield, preached at the Central Presbyterian Church, Rochester, Sunday morning, September 25, 1881, on the text, 2 Samuel, 2 : 23—"And it came to pass that as many as came to the place where Asahel fell down and died, stood still."

and character of the departed. President Garfield was a man of whom we have very many reasons as a people to be proud. He was a noble example of what is almost distinctively American, the rise of native ability and energy from the lowest to the highest positions in the social scale. Left fatherless at an early age but under the tutelage of a mother of intrepid spirit, his hard work in the fields only develops a rugged constitution, his narrow opportunities for schooling rouse an eager thirst for knowledge, the bullying of larger boys stimulates a just assertion of his rights. He becomes conscious of power, first as a student, then as a teacher, finally as a public speaker. He has a manly, healthy, sound spirit; and he makes his way by rapid strides through a college course, into active work as a professor, and finally to the head of the institution where he got his first taste of a liberal training. He has convictions, and a manly way of propagating his opinions, that wins the hearts of his pupils. Without being ordained to the ministry of the gospel, he naturally drifts into preaching. He defends Christianity against spiritualism and infidelity. He advocates Free Soil doctrine in the contest with slavery. At twenty-eight, he is State Senator of Ohio. At thirty, he is Brigadier-General in the Army. Rosecranz at first distrusts him, as a preacher who has gone into politics, just as Cameron afterwards declares that a broken-down preacher has no right to be nominated for the Presidency. But there is no break-down about the preacher, after all. Chickamauga makes him Major-General. Then he is needed in Congress, and to Congress he goes. There for eighteen years he holds a place second to none, for consistent and intelligent defense of sound principles in legislation and in politics. As Chairman, first of the Committee on Military Affairs, then of the Committees on Banking and Currency and on Appropriations, he presents to the House of Representatives and to the country as valuable a body of opinion on great questions of political economy and administration as has come from any statesman in our history except Alexander Hamilton and Daniel Webster.

Many of those before me remember that most admirable address in which, three years ago, he advocated in our City Hall the endangered cause of a sound currency. That speech, so simple yet so powerful, so free from all appeals to prejudice, so full of calm and convincing reasoning, was enough to show to an enemy of our institutions the wonderful educating power of a political campaign under our system of government, and the certainty that with proper instruction the people could be trusted to decide aright. He had made the subject of finance his study for years, and one of his speeches in Congress begins: "Mr. Speaker,— I remember that on the monument of Queen Elizabeth, where her glories were recited and her honors summed up, among the last and the highest, recorded as the climax of her honors, was this, that she restored the money of her kingdom to its just value. And when this House shall have done its work — when it shall have brought back values to their proper standard,— it will deserve a monument." The House of Representatives and the nation combined did that very thing. James A. Garfield had much to do with setting that tide of public opinion that repressed corrupt silver legislation, that compelled a return to specie payments, and that branded as fraud all edging toward a repudiation of our public debt,— and for this, if for nothing else, he deserves a monument.

From that influential position in Congress he was suddenly raised to the chief-magistracy of this great nation, and before time was given him for the full development of his policy, he has been now, as suddenly, taken from us. The purity of his private life, the warmth of his family affections, his love for wife and children and for the good old mother who tended and trained him when a boy, will stand side by side with George Washington's, as examples to a nation. The success which crowned a just ambition, the rising by right methods to the highest place of power, the scholarship and genuine mastery of public questions by which he achieved his honors, above all the high moral tone of his public life, will be an inspiration forever to American youth. I trust that to all this he joined the virtues of the true Christian. In his early days, and during the war, he knew what it was to pray. He was always faithful to his church in its outward observances. When the fatal shot struck him down, it was God's will to which he submitted himself, whether that will was life or death. The cares of office and the pressure of political life may have dulled his early religious feelings and made his devotions less earnest than once they were wont to be. I could have wished to hear from that sick-room plain recognitions of God's presence, voices of prayer to him who could save him from death, utterances of trust in Christ alone, as his soul prepared to go forth alone into the great darkness. But though these things are withheld from us, we look to the total record of his life and feel that the spirit of it was Christian. We can more easily explain the unmurmuring fortitude of those weeks of suffering, if we assume that a stronger than human arm sustained him. And now that he is gone, we feel that death glorifies him; we take the nobility and high purpose of his life, as we did in the case of Abraham Lincoln, as signs of an inner life that men could not see; we leave him reverently and hopefully with God, trusting that he has entered upon rest and reward, and waiting for the revelations of that day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed.

I call you now, in the second place, to stand still in grateful recognition of the alleviating circumstances with which divine Providence has attended our sorrow. For, if we are Christians at all, we must recognize a divine Providence in all such events as these. Let us call it a permissive Providence, for none of us would hold that God by any act of his inspired the murderous intent or aimed the shot of the assassin. But what God does not work he may foresee and permit, while yet the acts of his creatures are free, guilty, and punishable. God does not always deem it best to prevent man's wickedness from pursuing its chosen course and so revealing its real nature. So there is no crime of man which God has not foreknown and provided for — not one that he has not arranged to control and overrule for good. God might have palsied the hand of Guiteau, but it was his plan rather to make that very wrath of man turn to his praise. God made the treachery of Judas the means of the world's redemption. And so, throughout human history, God makes human passion and wickedness, in spite of themselves, to bring about his purposes of good. His voice calls to us today: "Be still and know that I am God," and assures us that even these crimes and sorrows are among the "all things that work together for good."

Will it impose too great a burden upon your faith if I go further, and say

that we are bound also to believe that, in this sad event, over which a whole people are mourning, God has answered our prayers? This ought not to perplex us, but I know how often it does perplex us. I can see good from this calamity from the new lesson it is teaching us with regard to the true nature of answers to prayer. I fear there is an enthusiastic and unscriptural notion in many minds, the notion that a great desire for a specific blessing is proof that that blessing will certainly be granted us when we ask it of God. The Bible should have taught us better. Did not Christ our Lord pray: "If it be possible, let this cup pass from me." Yet his Father's will was that he should drink that cup. Were not all of Christ's prayers answered? Was not that very prayer answered? We get the secret of all in the last words of that same prayer: "Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt." So "Thy will be done" is the essence of all true prayer. When God sees it best for us to give just what we ask, he gives it; when he sees it best for us not to give, he gives, not what we ask, but what we ought to ask. In either case, prayer is answered; blessing comes to us that never would have come, if prayer had not gone before; the very prayers we offer are links arranged by God between his decree and its fulfilment. Prayer is answered, whether we receive what we expect or not; and let us be sure that blessing will come to this nation as the result of the multitudinous petitions that have risen before God's throne — blessing larger and better than we in our poor wisdom are able to conceive.

Some blessings we can already see. Great sorrows like this make a whole people one. They educate our youth to patriotism. The solemnities of this day and of the morrow will cause a love of country and a sense of its greatness to thrill the soul of many a boy and girl that never felt it before. One of the earliest of my recollections is the draping of the church, and the memorial sermon, and the funeral procession, when William Henry Harrison died. I believe I have never ceased to feel the influence of that service. How much more deep and all-pervading is the grief of this hour! The telegraph and the press have brought a whole nation to stand as watchers by one bedside, aye, have made a whole nation parts of one family. A bond of sympathy has been established that makes all classes one. Such things as these make a nation strong, teach it the dignity and worth of national life, prepare it to resist attack from without, nerve it to put down the evils that threaten from within. There may be dangers in our civil system with which our late President would have been too weak to grapple. His death may do more than his life,— it may rouse within this people an unappeasable determination to bring them to an end. But this feeling is wider than the nation. It has overspread the world. There probably has never been a death — never an event of any kind — that has awakened such quick and world-wide sorrow. Methinks it is the prophecy of that coming day when the whole race of man shall become conscious of its organic unity; when one impulse of love and loyalty shall pervade every human heart; when all shall grieve and all rejoice together; when total humanity shall be like one great organ of many stops and keys, all vibrating to one grand harmony under the mighty constraining breath of the one Spirit of God.

We have had time, too, to prepare us for this calamity. Had death instantly followed the murderous shot, there would have been stirred far

more of partizan passion. It would have seemed almost the fruit of a conspiracy. We know better now. No fear now disturbs us that our government is to become like that of Russia or of Turkey—a "despotism tempered by assassination." There is no nihilism abroad in the land. The deed is not significant of anarchy. When the bells sounded out on Monday night, no one's blood ran cold with the thought that revolution was to follow. Other lands, in other days, have not felt safe as we. How great God's gift to us, that the change from one ruler to another creates not the slightest jar in the great system! In language like that which Tacitus used of the Roman state, so we may say: Presidents are mortal, but the Republic is eternal. The very contemptuous silence with which the weak miscreant who did this dreadful deed has been regarded, shows, far better than words, how little significance belongs to him and to his individual purpose. With him let justice have her way. Let him be an example to all coming time of the abhorrence and the condemnation and the punishment that belong to the murderer of the head of a nation. And yet the greatest crime of human history was the murder of Christ, and Christ abhorred that crime as only one possessed of divine holiness could. And Christ prayed for his murderers. The penitent thief died by crucifixion, but the penitent thief was saved in answer to Christ's prayer. My friends, justice and pity are not incompatible. It is only the man who hates iniquity that can truly pray. He who most surely dooms the unrepentant transgressor to death can most truly love his soul. I am reminded of Mr. Finney's answer to the question what he would do if the only way to save a fugitive slave from being taken back to bondage was to shoot the master who was attempting to play the part of the kidnapper. "I would kill him," said Mr. Finney,—"but I would love him with all my heart." So we may hate the crime of Guiteau and with one voice demand that he be hanged between heaven and earth, but we may also, and at the same time, pray that God may have mercy on his soul.

I trust this calamity will teach us also our dependence as a nation upon God. We have not prayed enough for our rulers. It is a pleasing part of the English Church service that there never fails a petition for the Queen, that God may endue her with his best gifts for the discharge of her high office, and may grant her in health and wealth long to live. Let us never forget our President. And then let us so reform our system of choosing Vice-Presidents that we shall practically answer our own prayers. To make the nomination for Vice-President a mere matter of conciliation to a defeated faction, in the hope that the result will be of no significance, is simply to tempt Providence, and to hazard the most important interests of the country. In almost every case where the Vice-President has succeeded to office since the adoption of our Constitution, the consequences have been a most sudden and violent change of policy in the administration, an unsettling of public confidence in the stability of the government, and a rousing of political passions which have blocked the wheels of legislation. The inadvertent defects of our political system can be revealed only in such times as these. God may teach us our needs by this very trial. May we depend upon him and seek his wisdom.

But all these thoughts only lead me on to what, in my judgment, is the great lesson of the hour. I would have you, therefore, in the third place,

stand still in penitent contemplation of the special sin of this people which has been at least the indirect cause of President Garfield's death. When I speak of a special wickedness among us which has virtually aimed the pistol that killed our President, I am not inconsistent with what I said a moment ago. I do not charge this crime upon any band of conscious conspirators. But there is an evil among us, a general tendency in our government, a method in our politics, which I brand as the guilty cause of this atrocious murder. That I may not seem to you to be dealing in mere figures of speech, let me quote you a sentence from General Garfield's speech in the House of Representatives on the day after the assassination of President Lincoln. "It was no one man," he said, "it was no one man that killed Abraham Lincoln; it was the spirit of treason and slavery, inspired with despairing hate, that struck him down." As General Garfield then charged Lincoln's assassination to the system of slavery, so I now charge Garfield's own assassination to the spoils-system, which beginning with Aaron Burr, Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, has degraded our whole political life into a selfish struggle for office, and which proclaims as its motto the principle that to the victor in this struggle belong the spoils of the enemy.

Years ago, in my first visit to England, I was hospitably entertained at the house of the Postmaster of Oxford. He was a dissenter of one of the straitest sects. He was personally obnoxious to the dignitaries of the University, and of the Church to whom Oxford is an earthly Paradise. He was a liberal in politics, while the administration in power was Tory. Yet, in spite of these disadvantages, he held on in his office, and had held on through all changes of government for more than twenty years. How do I explain it? Simply in this way: He was a capable and faithful public officer; he administered the business of his office on economical business principles; he knew his work as Postmaster better than any one else; and no government, Tory or Liberal, thought for a moment of removing him. Would the Oxford public have been better served, if every four years had witnessed a change; if each time some new incumbent had had to learn the trade; if these successive Postmasters had been put there, not so much to secure the expeditious delivery of the mails, as to manage caucuses and to secure votes for the party; if the tenure of office had been absolutely dependent on the retention of that party in power?

And yet these last hypotheses represent the real state of our public service. Offices are distributed as tokens of private friendship or rewards of political service; insecurity of tenure renders the administration of these trusts inefficient, and leads directly to efforts to make the most out of the positions while they last; the absence of proper tests of character and competency permits the crowding of these places with men whose only merit is that they know how to manage the machine and keep the body of voters subservient to the will of a limited number of party managers. In the New York Custom House, where the government levies duties every year on merchandise worth a thousand millions of dollars, an office where long experience, thorough competency and the most scrupulous honesty would seem to be most pressing needs, Collector Schell, in 1858, removed 389 out of 690 officials; Collector Barney removed 525 out of 702; and in 1866 Collector Smythe removed 830 out of 903. Who can compute the distress of these

officials at a change in the administration! For many of them change is ruin. They adopt corrupt methods to retain their positions, or they feather their nests before the time of change is upon them. The New York Custom House is but the type of some six thousand offices to which the United States Senate has the right of confirmation; of 100,000 subordinates of all ranks and names, through whom the President executes the laws; of 250,000 officials, national, state and municipal, throughout the land. The interest which all these have in elections is, not public interest, but selfish interest. This personal interest makes every political campaign a battle, not of reason or principle, not of intelligence or discussion, but a life and death fight for place, for perquisites, for subsistence, for spoils. Because everything is at stake for them, this vast body can organize, so that the few can govern the many; men of character are driven out of politics; democracy becomes a cheat and a lie; and the lowest rule. The result is such inefficiency and extravagance, such dishonesty and defalcation, that it costs us three times as much proportionally to collect our revenue as it does in France, four times as much as it does in Germany, and five times as much as it does in England.

The system of spoils has overwhelmed the Executive and his Cabinet. Three-quarters of the time of the President is consumed in listening to claims for office. Out of 720 calls upon a single Cabinet officer, 710 had to do with applications for place. In 1872, General Garfield, then in Congress, uttered these words: "For many years Presidents of the United States have been crying out in their agony to be relieved of the unconstitutional, crushing, irresistible pressure brought to bear upon them by the entire body of that party in the legislative department which elected them." By the so-called courtesy of the Senate, that body has usurped executive functions, while by working for office-seekers the House has made it well nigh impossible to devote proper time to the public business. It is a system that inspires every excitable voter with the belief that he too has a right to a share in the spoils of his party. It is a system that invites Guiteau to the Capital, and then maddens him by delays. It is a system that turns public office into public plunder, and that transforms the citizen's reverence for the Chief-magistrate into murderous hatred, and that wings the bullet to his heart as the swiftest means of bringing about a new deal.

Into these last few moments I have condensed the substance of a most able and stirring article in the last Princeton Review by Dorman B. Eaton, Esq., of New York. But there is much more to be said, than has been said by Mr. Eaton. I have come here to-day to utter the whole truth as I believe it needs to be uttered. I must say to you that there can be no more impressive illustration of the all-encompassing grasp of this gigantic evil than the official history of our departed Chief-magistrate. With a Congressional record that was unimpeachable behind him, with many an utterance in which he had pointed out the need of reform and had marked out the path to be followed, General Garfield hardly found himself the nominee of the Republican Party, before he felt the need of conciliating that powerful machine which by its opposition or its indifference might frustrate his election. The result was a letter of acceptance in which ambiguities took the place of clear statement, and the concession was made that Members of Congress have a right to be heard with regard to the appointments in their

districts. He entered upon his high office, and we have now to mourn that the vast majority of the time he had to give to his country was given, under compulsion, to listening to the vast horde of office-seekers, who besieged him at the White House and urged their claims to a share in the distribution of the spoils. With a still lingering notion that official place might properly be made a reward for private or party service, he was led, in violation of his own expressed principle that no public servant should be removed before the expiration of his term, except for malfeasance in office, to transfer the Collector of the Port of New York to a position of lower rank and to put in his place one whose chief claim was that he had been a strong opponent of another wing of the party and an influential advocate of his own nomination. I do not believe that these inconsistencies indicated the set purpose and temper of his mind. I trust that, had he lived, he would have risen superior to the malign influences that were about him, and that a healthy moral nature would have overcome this worse than malarious poison that infects our political atmosphere. Still we must be true to facts and to God. With what we may acknowledge to be good intents and plans for the future, even President Garfield allowed himself to take wrong steps at the beginning of his presidential career — steps which it would have cost many political friendships and much of moral courage to retrace.

I recognize in general the principle, "*nil de mortuis nisi bonum.*" But the crisis upon us is too terrible to permit a public teacher to mince his words. An apotheosis of President Garfield is not the best service to his memory, nor to the country which he loved and sought to serve. It will not detract from our sorrow, to acknowledge that he was human and that he erred. We need to acknowledge the fact, because only in the light of it can we see how deeply-rooted is the evil we are called to combat. It is with Presidents as it is with Popes. Before their accession, they are not uncommonly reformers. Once in office, they find themselves not so much engineers as passengers, on a moving train whose direction and momentum apparently require more than mortal energy to change. They find that there is a machine; that well nigh all their advisers and associates belong to it; that its instinctive and almost resistless movement is in traditional directions and after traditional methods. Presidents and Popes were intended to lead, — but alas, it is so much easier to follow! They are like Laocoön and his sons in the folds of the serpents, — they writhe, but they succumb. This is what every President has done thus far — even President Hayes. All have more or less recognized and yielded to the doctrine that positions of trust under government may properly be made the means of controlling a party, of propitiating enemies, of rewarding friends.

I deem it time to say these things, because the American people will never listen if they will not listen now. If this time passes by and the warning voice is unheard, it may take years of yet deeper corruption and of more selfish partizanship, to open the eyes of the nation. For it is the nation — it is we ourselves — who are at fault. The trouble with both President Hayes and President Garfield was, not that they had not sound convictions, but that they feared the people were not sufficiently in earnest to support them. How sad now seems the end of our President's career! Killed by the very spirit which he was willing to some extent to conciliate! The bullet of

Guiteau was not the work of a few politicians disappointed in their greedy clamor for place,— but it was indirectly the result of a system which we all have fostered, when we ought to have lifted up our voices and our hands against it. Well was it said, a short time ago, that the American people has as yet but a superficial interest in the reform of our civil service. We have not done our duty in protesting against this prostitution of our public service to the base uses of a horde of machine politicians. Guiteau, with his passionate clamor to be fed out of the public crib, is but the type of a spirit that has been all-pervasive among us — the spirit that would use the public service for private gain,— and therefore for that bullet of Guiteau we ourselves are more or less responsible, and for it ought to repent before Almighty God.

We hoped for future public utterances and acts on the part of our dead President which would show his heart still right on this great subject, and which would lead the way to the complete wiping-out of the accursed evil. And the worst forebodings which many of us have had with regard to the incoming administration have arisen from the fact that the new President has hitherto seemed, not from compulsion but from choice, to adopt the aims and to use the methods of the stock politician. Did ever any ruler of men so need the prayers of the good as Chester A. Arthur does to-day? We have tried to hope that these last months may have taught him wisdom; may have led him to see that there were certain moral forces at work in this nation whose existence he had not counted on before; may have led him to look with incipient distrust upon the counselors whom he has hitherto followed. But in estimating the probabilities of the future, I have been unable to forget that President Arthur owes his political being to a stronger man than he — a man who is the very representative and embodiment of the system we abhor. By all rules of political honor, or rather dishonor, he is bound to exalt his creator,— and his creator is Roscoe Conkling. As Vice-President of the United States he soiled his great office by lobbying at Albany for his chief, when that chief was squabbling for the Senatorship he had thrown away. Let the President now appoint Mr. Conkling his Secretary of State, let the broken machine be rehabilitated, let all the arts that both know so well how to use be employed to strengthen and consolidate it, let the offices be packed with men pledged to advance its interests, let newspapers and politicians and people who prefer the semblance of power and success to principle and the public good, all join in hallelujahs to the ability, the force, and the thoroughly American character of the new administration, and we shall see a perpetuation of this spoils-system and a further lease of power given to its defenders and advocates such as will bind an honest but too submissive nation in chains for another twenty years.

Nowhere, except in the Arabian Nights, where the barber becomes Grand Vizier, do I remember so sudden, unmerited, and dizzying an elevation as that by which the former Collector of the Port of New York has first become Vice-President, and then President of the United States. If President Arthur has only been taught wisdom by the outburst of public feeling that followed the shot of the assassin; if he will only cut himself loose from association with the set of professional politicians whose methods have roused such abhorrence among thinking and patriotic men; if he will only

remember that it is for no goodness that there is in him that he has been put in this place of responsibility and power, and that respect for his administration will be wholly dependent upon his good behavior, he may yet furnish reason to think that the death of President Garfield was not an unrelieved calamity. But if Providence has otherwise ordered, and it is our lot to have the spoils-system in its worst features revived; to see wholesale changes in our public offices for the mere sake of perpetuating the power of a few and of rewarding personal services at the polls; to experience a still further degradation of our civil service in the line of inflaming party passion, of making our elections mere squabbles for spoils, of turning our legislatures into mere assemblies for the ratification of the decrees of the managers of the machine,— still we will not despair of the Republic, but will believe it simply the will of Providence that the evil should grow ripe before its fall, that its monstrosity should become so hateful as to rouse universal opposition, that like slavery it should meet its doom in the very act of subjugating all things to its sway. The accession of President Arthur should be the signal, not for blind acquiescence in the inevitable, if that inevitable be the extension and deepening of corruption in our politics,— it should be the signal for united determination on the part of all Christians and all patriots, all thinking and good men of whatever party or name, that our civil service shall be reformed, and that the accursed system of spoils shall be done away forever from our politics.

I am not unmindful that every incoming Executive is entitled to the support and confidence of the nation until he has proved himself unworthy. That confidence and support we should render him on his entrance upon his duties, and just so long as he remains faithful to his trust. May God enlighten and keep him! May God lift him up above low partizanship, and enable him to live for his country and for the future! There are many things to encourage the hope that he will do so. He is the son of Christian parents. His father was a Baptist minister. He has at least the ordinary respect for religion and for morality. His private life is above reproach. The letter in which he accepted the nomination for the Vice-Presidency, and the brief address which accompanied the final taking of the oath of office as President, will compare favorably with the utterances of General Garfield under similar circumstances. Above all, his modest and serious bearing during the weeks of suspense that have intervened between the shot of the assassin and the death of the late President, have drawn to him a popular sympathy and have awakened a general hopefulness which will prove most valuable helps in the adoption and carrying out of a truly statesmanlike policy. The country waits with patience and with good will to second and further every step in the direction of wise administration. If he shall devote himself to the reform of abuses, if he shall choose men of principle for his advisers, if he shall conduct the government upon business methods, if he shall scorn to be the servant of a selfish clique, if he shall rise to the dignity of a true President, then every Christian and every honest man will applaud him and award him a lofty place among the great men of history. We pray most devoutly that he may know and seize his opportunity. But if, with all these motives and influences to favor a right course, he shall pursue the wrong; if he shall put himself under the control of an

unscrupulous faction; if he shall set himself to turn back the current that has been running more and more strongly toward reform in our civil service; if he shall use the vast patronage of his office to raise up a new army of place-holders devoted to his personal interests and bent upon the consolidation and perpetuation of their ill-used power,—then we utter to him a voice of warning; we assure him of indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish; of implacable hostility on the part of the intelligence and virtue of the land; of opposition to his administration shown by all legal and constitutional means; of political ruin to himself and to his party; of everlasting fame as a betrayer of his country. Like the king of Babylon, he stands at the parting of the way. Two roads diverge from the spot which his feet now tread. May God save him from choosing the wrong course! May God give him grace to choose the right!

So let us all stand still, in appreciative remembrance of the life and character of the departed; in grateful recognition of the alleviating circumstances with which divine Providence has attended our sorrow; in penitent contemplation of the special sin of this people which has been the indirect cause of President Garfield's death. I suppose that if all those soldiers of Israel stood still, and looked at the dead body of Asahel, then each one individually must have stood still. Have we done this to-day? Have I individually — have you, each of you and singly — stood still, in reverence, in gratitude, in penitence? Ah, these general reflections will be of little use, unless we make them personal to ourselves. Let us hear what God the Lord will speak to *us*. The life and character of General Garfield were gifts of God to you and me; you and I need to render thanks for many mercies which accompany this cup of sorrow; above all, you and I need to humble ourselves for our sins, and to address ourselves to the duty of the hour. There is a mighty feeling abroad in the land — a feeling strong enough and deep enough, if only organized into practical action, to remove from us the transgressions which have provoked God's anger and have endangered the safety of the nation. God will be with us, if we are but true to him. If we will only stand still, in fixed resolve to return to God and to the old paths of honesty and truth, we may also stand still and see the salvation of God,—and, as for those enemies of our peace, we shall see them no more again forever.

XXXV.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND ITS COMING.*

The ancient world was full of unconscious prophecies of Christ. Long before the "Desire of all nations" had come, philosophy was waiting to lay her unsolved problems before the mighty Prophet, and the polytheistic religions were seeking for the Priest who could give atoning efficacy to their sacrifices. And not less was it true that all the political systems of the earth, confessing their own poverty and imperfection, were standing in silent expectation of his advent who was King by right divine. All kingdoms that preceded his, were in some sort types and prefigurations of the coming kingdom of God. The very end for which the Jewish kingdom existed under David and Solomon, was to fix in the mind of a select people the idea of a monarchy grander far in unity, strength and splendor. And the vast world-empires of Chaldæa, Greece and Rome, were they of no use or value to the humanity that bore their heavy burdens? Let us not so deny the providential ordering of history. These were but the vain attempts of human nature to anticipate God's great plan of universal dominion — attempts permitted by God to prepare mankind for the kingdom of his Son. Yes, all the self-deifying schemes of world-wide conquest which Nebuchadnezzar, Alexander and Augustus ever formed were but dim prefigurations of the coming reign of Christ. These men were but the representatives of universal longings and aspirations. Rome would never have grasped at the empire of the world, had there not been an answering instinct of monarchy in the world's great heart,—her name among the nations and her gigantic sway rested upon that deep principle of human nature which moves the race to seek blindly for the restoration of its primal unity,—her magic influence over all lands and the terror of her imperial decrees would never have been possible, had she not been the specious counterfeit of another world-wide kingdom of spiritual influences and of living dependence upon an invisible head.

Rome was not herself the kingdom for which the nations longed. She was rather the great dragon of the Revelation, seeking to devour the feeble child who was the true hope of the world. But though the dragon's material supremacy was represented by the seven crowns upon its seven heads, and its control over the world's spiritual lights and rulers by the third part of the stars of heaven which were carried off by the sweep of its tail, yet this feeble child, seemingly so easy a prey, was to escape its jaws and, nourished secretly by God, was at length to rule the nations with a rod of iron — so to rule as to break their hostility and to bring them into willing subjection to its government and laws. The coming of Christ has antiquated the notion

* A Sermon before the Judson Society of Missionary Inquiry, Brown University Providence, R. I., August 31, 1869.

of any universal monarchy except his own. It is already dimly seen that the sublime ambition of reducing the whole earth under one head, and fusing its heterogeneous populations into one great empire, is hopeless of accomplishment except by the hands of him who adds to all human perfections the power and wisdom of a God.

The Psalms, in their language of magnificent metaphor, speak of the governments of the world as the "great mountains," and of warlike, oppressive, robbing states as "mountains of prey,"—and who would deny that the ancient mountains that lift their white heads above the clouds and plant their feet at the centre of the earth, watching in moveless majesty the dawning and death of the centuries, are apt emblems of those dynasties that have ruled the race for ages? But when the prophetic Scriptures would describe the kingdom of Christ, the figure is immeasurably expanded and exalted. That kingdom is a mountain also, but a mountain that grows from the smallest beginnings to an inconceivable greatness. First a stone cut out of the hillside without any agency of man and by the invisible hand of God, it rolls onward, increasing as it goes, until it crushes into dust the images men have built to take its place, and becomes a great mountain that not only overtops and swallows up every mountain of the world, but fills at last the whole circuit of the earth. In such grand symbolic language does inspiration set forth to us the truth that Christ shall reign until all enemies shall be put beneath his feet, all humanity shall be united in him as its head, and his universal monarchy shall embrace earth as well as heaven.

I address this evening a society of young men whose organization derives dignity and worth from its connection with this kingdom of God. It seeks by inquiry into the condition of the world, and the forces which God has prepared to subdue it, to determine the truest direction and methods of coming efforts for the advancement of Christ's cause. These early days of preparation for the work of life may well be spent in such inquiry, and the name that is emblazoned on your banner, the name of the greatest modern missionary laborer, may well serve for your example and inspiration. I bring to you, therefore, to stimulate your search for truth and point to you the way of duty, this prayer and promise of Christ. There is no sentence in the book of inspiration which more clearly expresses the ultimate aim of God, and thus the great end of life for us. It constitutes the dominant thought of the Lord's prayer — the thought indeed that meets us at the very threshold of it. When he who was the type and model of humanity left a type and model for men's prayers, he began, not with the expression of human wants, but with petitions for God's glory,— not first, "give us this day our daily bread, forgive us our trespasses, lead us not into temptation,"— but "hallowed be thy name,— thy kingdom come!" And this because the moment that prayer "thy kingdom come" is answered, the satisfaction of all human wants is sure. We cannot then in any way so enlarge our hearts or prepare us for our coming work as by contemplating this one petition into which all our human prayers, so far as they avail anything, may be resolved. May this contemplation help us to see with greater clearness the magnificence of God's kingdom, and, so seeing, to pray and labor with stronger heart that earth may be reconciled to heaven, and that both may be made the perfect instrument of God's sovereignty and revelation.

First, then, we ask "what is this kingdom?" and the most obvious reply is that the kingdom of God is a kingdom in the soul. You cannot mark out on any map its geographical limits. You cannot bound it by mountain ranges, or measure it by the length of continents. It has nothing to do with any of the natural divisions of the earth, for it is a spiritual not an earthly kingdom, and all lands are to come within its boundaries at last only because all the souls of men are to be subject to its dominion. When Nicodemus imagines it confined to a chosen land or people, he must learn that neither one's physical dwelling-place nor connection with any nation makes one partaker of its rights and privileges. "The kingdom of God is within you," says Jesus, and no protracted pilgrimages nor outward professions nor priestly manipulations will bring us into it. It is a kingdom of spirits, whose King is a Spirit, ruling not by deputies but directly by his spiritual presence in the hearts of his subjects. In earthly kingdoms, the rule is external, by written laws, by subordinate authorities. The King cannot be everywhere at once — he must delegate his power. But God is everywhere, and needs no representative or viceroy. The Holy Spirit, whose indwelling in the soul is the evidence of our naturalization in this kingdom, is no simple divine influence apart from God, but is the very presence of the King himself. This is the greatness of human nature, that the high and lofty One who inhabiteth eternity will make the soul of man his palace and his temple.

Of this reign of God in the soul and his constant working and revelation there, all the methods of his rule and operation in nature are but echoes and symbols. There is a concurrence of God needful to support my physical organism in every breath I draw, whether I sleep or wake. The Hebrew prophets were far nearer the truth than our rationalizing philosophers, when they heard God's voice in the thunder and saw his beauty in the cloud-lit skies. Not only in the wrathful moods of nature, when fire and earthquake speed forth on errands of justice, but in the broad sweep of productive agencies which furnish food to the sower and bread to the eater, God is present — no passive spectator, but working hitherto and forever, the motive power of all that moves, the life of all that lives. But all this indwelling and co-working of God in nature is only the rough picture-card by which he teaches us who are children, how great and blessed a thing is his indwelling and co-working in the soul. The earthly bread by which he sustains us is but a faint symbol of the true Bread that came down from heaven to nourish and feed our souls. The earthly vine to which he gives life that it may keep alive its branches is but the faint symbol of that true original archetypal Vine which has its roots in heaven, not on earth, and to which all the scattered, half-withered branches of humanity are to be reunited that they may again have life divine.

And here is God's true reign and kingdom, not in nature. In nature he has never ceased to reign,— his life sustains even the bodies of those who sin against him. But he has humbled himself to give man an independent will, by which he may cut his soul loose from God's spiritual rule, though he never can break the bond of physical dependence. This kingdom in the souls of earth's revolted millions God would restore, and it is this kingdom which we pray may come. It is little for God to rule in nature, so long as he rules not in the heart. For the soul of man is greater and grander, when

judged by the standards of eternity, than all the physical universe beside. Only spiritual existence is of everlasting significance; the soul shall live, when the stars shall fade and die. Nature is unchanging — she has no capacity for growth; but man has powers capable of indefinite expansion; his is the fearful heritage of an endless progress towards good or ill. All our figurative representations of the breadth of his nature, and the variety of his endowments, only mock the reality. There are continents within him which no Columbus has ever yet discovered, and heights of capacity which the eagle's eye hath not seen. He has a will which is the strongest thing in the universe next to God — a will which measures its strength too often by resisting God and resisting him forever. A whole heaven, a whole hell, may be found within the compass of that single soul. And the majesty of God, when throned and templed in that single soul, is greater than when he sits upon the circle of the heavens and all the shining orbs of his material creation weave their mazy dance beneath his feet.

But if the kingdom of God be ever set up in this soul of man, it must be a kingdom of grace and not a kingdom of force. Once gain a proper conception of it as a spiritual kingdom, and from that moment you perceive that it is its essential glory to exclude all thought of compulsory obedience. It is not so with earthly governments, even though they be the best. How often has the monarch's rule been little else than the sway of a malignant might like that of Satan! During the reign of the last king of Naples, the stranger in his capital observed that the fortress which juts out into that beautiful bay to protect the city from the attack of a foreign fleet, instead of pointing its guns toward the sea, had turned them all inward upon the town. It was easy for him to mark the scowl of hatred that crossed the faces of the people as their eyes fell upon those cannon, so admirably planted to sweep with grape and canister the principal streets of the city, and if need be, to batter down the houses of rich and poor alike with a rain of shot and shell. The silent mouths of those great guns uttered a continual menace — they spoke no language but that of threats, and it was no wonder that the people, when their time had come, rose like Samson, broke the green withes with which tyranny had bound them, and flung them to the winds forever.

The world imagines that God's government maintains its supremacy by main force in like manner, and that his law, like Neapolitan cannon, utters only the language of threatening and wrath. But this is man's slander and detraction of God's kingdom, — it is not a kingdom of power and justice merely, — the very art and wisdom of God consist in demonstrating to blinded hearts that it is a kingdom of pure and infinite grace. In what wondrous ways does God conduct this demonstration! Could human imagination ever have dreamed in its wildest flights that the "eternal Sovereign, the incorruptible, invisible, only God," would become man, accept the limitations of human nature, make humanity a part of himself forever, in order that a race that maligned his government and character might understand him, and thus be led to love him? Yet this is the very thing which God has done. The King of kings has come down from his place of power, has become one of this same sinning, suffering race, has known in his own body what the pains and trials and temptations of human nature are, has proved, by personal contact

with the sinners and by endless ministries of love, how great is his sympathy with their needs, and then, feeling their depravity and hatred as none but he who was holiness and love could feel them, has yet put himself in their place of guilt and shame, has borne the dreadful chastisement due to their offences, has paid their debts by pouring out his blood, and then has lain a mangled corpse in the very grave where all mankind were doomed to hopeless burial. And now this brother-man, having conquered death for us, and having risen for our redemption, with a brother's sympathizing heart, and more than a brother's claims to love, sits upon the throne of the universe, all power in heaven and earth being given into his hand. Oh, who can mistake God any longer! As we gaze upon our crowned and sceptered Savior, with the human tears scarce dry upon his cheeks and the brother's compassion still beaming from his eye, we see that God is not a God of power and justice only, but a God of infinite self-sacrifice. For let us never forget that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,— it is only in Christ that we can see or know the Father. We have no other God and no other King but him whose character and government are revealed in the God-man, Christ Jesus.

So the King became man,— but there is a greater wonder still — he became man that men might become kings. God took to himself human nature, that human nature might be reunited to God. Ah, we have failed to see the grandeur of the divine kingdom, if we have not perceived that it consists in an actual union with the life of God in Jesus Christ. The submission which it seeks is not the submission which degrades. Its law is the law of liberty and love, written on the heart by Christ the King. It is a kingdom of free spirits, whose freedom is assured and exalted by partaking of the divine nature, and by receiving evermore the currents of the divine life to nourish and sustain their own. More intimate and indissoluble than the union of husband and wife, or of the stock and branches of the vine, is the union of our souls with Christ. We are in Christ as the very element in which we live and move and have our being, and Christ is in us the very spring of all our life and activity. The truth of which Pantheism is but the blind and unhallowed perversion — the truth that God is all and in all — is not only the very foundation of the Christian scheme, but in Christianity is first made a matter of living experience and consciousness.

The very central truth of all theology, and of all religion, is the union of the believer with God in Jesus Christ — not the union that destroys or confounds, but the union that preserves and glorifies the personality of God and the personality of the human soul. By this union, the subject of the divine kingdom comes to participate in the character and blessedness of God,— for God's righteousness, peace and joy are his. By this union he comes to participate in the divine glory. Even here he is a citizen of heaven, a son of God, on whose brow the angels see glittering a crown of immortality. And what earthly eye hath seen, or what earthly tongue can tell, the future majesty and greatness of those to whom it is the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom! They are to sit with Christ upon his throne — they are to judge angels — they are to be kings and priests unto God. They are to shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. They are to have spiritual organisms like that glorified body of Christ which John saw

on the Isle of Patmos. Having given up all to Christ, they are to receive all things from him. Having lifted up the gates of the soul to welcome the universal Sovereign to supreme dominion, they are to find themselves kings in his kingdom. In the Apocalypse, there is a vision of a woman clothed with the sun, with a crown of twelve stars upon her head, and the moon beneath her feet. It is the symbol of the church of Christ, girt about with divine and celestial glory, having heaven's own light for hers, and so lifted up above the corruption and darkness of this lower sphere that she puts beneath her feet all that earth reckons dazzling and attractive. Such is the kingdom of Christ in the soul — a kingdom of inexhaustible and inconceivable grace.

But this kingdom of grace is not many, — it is one. That perfect glory of unity which has been imaged forth in poetry and architecture, in church hierarchies and universal empires, finds its archetype and realization only here. It is not a kingdom set up here and there in isolated souls, but a kingdom compact in organization and permeated with one life. It is the grandeur of human government that it approximates to the control of individual wills, and to some degree secures the subordination of men to law. To hold the reins of the fierce and uncertain winds so that they obey one's call, and speed forth upon one's errands, would be something marvelous, — but to guide and control millions of human wills more fickle and changeful than the winds, making them all yield homage to just law and reducing their wild impulses to order, is a task immeasurably greater. Only the divine kingdom blends all these diverse elements into complete and perfect unity. The kingdom of God contemplates nothing less than a gathering together, in one harmonious and blissful society, of all holy souls of all lands and ages.

It is a significant fact that the Bible does not end with the gospels and their setting forth of Christ's life and teachings, — does not end with the Acts of the Apostles and its proclamation of salvation to the nations through the crucified and risen Redeemer, — does not end with the epistles and their profound exposition of the indwelling of Christ in his church, — but ends with the Revelation of St. John, in which we see, through the glass of prophecy, the final victory of the Lamb over all the combined hosts of the world's opposition and rebellion, and the gathering of all the saints into the City of God. The salvation of the individual is not the great end of God's economy of redemption, but rather the erection of a glorious community of innumerable holy souls, bound together as here by a common character and destiny and life, and forever united there in a closeness of intercourse, a rapture of worship, and an intensity of loving activity, compared with which the streaming tides of life that meet and mingle in modern London, or that swept through the forum of Ancient Rome at the triumphal entries of her world-famed victors, were but mean and insignificant. Not isolation, but blessed and endless companionship, is to be the law of the kingdom of God.

> "O scenes surpassing fable, and yet true!
> Scenes of accomplished bliss! which who can see,
> Though but in distant prospect, and not feel
> His soul refreshed with foretaste of the joy!"

Nor is the kingdom a kingdom of this earth alone. Included in the broad design is the renovation of this sin-burdened planet, and the union of its life and history with those of other orders of creation. For man is not

the sole offspring of Jehovah. The universe is broad and full of glittering worlds. Our earth is but a speck in the vast expanse. We sometimes wonder whether the planets and suns of the Milky Way are inhabited. Astronomy cannot answer,— but the Scriptures assure us that, whether possessed of local habitations or not, there are in this universe myriads of majestic intelligences who pass to and fro on divine missions, and are specially interested in the grand drama that is representing on the earth. These principalities and powers in heavenly places, these ranks of unfallen illustrious angelic spirits, bend down from their lofty seats and peer into the mysterious progress of events upon this little globe,— for the planet where the King of glory bore the cross, though it is not the physical centre, must yet be the spiritual centre, of creation. Milton could not have been greatly wrong when he represented the unfallen Adam as blessed with the converse and instruction of angels. Our Savior, we have reason to believe, was declaring not only his own glory, but the normal and destined glory of human nature in him, when he asserted that his disciples should yet see the heavens opened, as they were in Jacob's dream of the heavenly ladder, and the angels ascending and descending upon the Son of man. But how fallen are we from our first estate! Still, as in Eden,

> "Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth,
> Unseen, both when we wake and when we sleep,"—

but our eyesight is not keen enough to behold them. The earth is not now a watch-tower, from which we may descry the pursuits of the glorified and observe the dealings of God with other spheres, but rather a prison-house, through whose bars we get only dim and faint glimpses of the great creation spread around us.

"Why is it," asks a late writer on astronomical discovery, "why is it, that man is doomed to this isolation in space, with no bond of sympathy between him and other worlds? Ah, it is sin that has made the earth a prison, instead of an abode of liberty where we might hold converse with other pure and glorious spirits. But are we doomed to this isolation forever? No, the yearnings of our own hearts and the teachings of revelation alike assure us that one grand aim of the scheme of redemption is to remedy and perfect the bond of sympathy that was broken by the fall, and to bring us into closer alliance with all the various grades of moral intelligences throughout the universe. The great system is like a magnificent harp, all whose strings are in tune but one. That one string out of tune makes a jar in the whole. The whole universe will feel the effects of redemption, when once this jarring world is put in tune by the hand of love and mercy." God's kingdom will not be fully come, until all things in the universe are gathered together and harmonized in Christ,—

> "And earth is changed to heaven, and heaven to earth,—
> One kingdom, joy, and union, without end."

For this kingdom, once established, shall never be destroyed. The causes that bring decrepitude and death to earthly monarchies shall never exist there. The infinite reaches of eternity shall be the arena which the inventive mind of God shall fill with revelations, and histories, and new creations. But all these ages shall be one. All dispensations as well as all worlds shall be reconciled in Christ. The saints shall sing the song of

Moses and the Lamb, not because the song of Moses at the Red Sea will fully express the rapture of God's redeemed, but because they shall see all God's great deliverances, from the days of Pharaoh's overthrow to the time of Satan's final downfall, to be all parts of one great whole, and all to be deliverances through the Lamb. To them God's incomprehensible designs shall be unveiled,—to them the mystery shall be finished. Taking in the wide prospect of God's universal empire, they shall behold in God's earliest dealings with the race the seeds and prophecies of all the future, and throughout the whole course of history shall perceive the order and beauty of an infinitely wise and symmetrical plan. Then they shall see that there has been a Christ in history, from the beginning to the end, working through history, and making known the glories and perfections of the one living and true God. The kingdom of God shall be the perfect revelation of himself in and to his creatures,—and therefore it shall be, not only a kingdom of righteousness, but a kingdom of eternity. The events of this little world with all its wondrous history are but a single part, though they may be the initial or central part, of a sublimer unity. The kingdom of God for which the old Hebrews looked in the midst of the ages, is not a kingdom of this world alone, or of all present worlds alone, but a kingdom of far-reaching ages, including all past, and present, and future worlds, with all their histories,—a kingdom not of space only, but also of duration, all-comprehending and infinite. For unto the Son hath the eternal Father said: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever!" The kingdom of grace shall be merged at last in the kingdom of glory,—but the laying down of Christ's mediatorial sceptre over this revolted province of his empire shall only inaugurate the fuller splendors of that perfected reign in which the triune God shall be all in all to his creatures.

Thus our thoughts are led on and on, as we contemplate the nature and extent of God's kingdom, till the greatness of it is overburdening and our weak faith staggers, even amid the intensity of our desire for its coming. Let us then betake ourselves to the prayer which our Lord has taught us: "Thy kingdom come." That teaches us three lessons; first, that the kingdom of Christ *shall* come,—it is God's design to answer that prayer, since no such prayer would ever have been left by Christ to his church, had it not been the purpose of him who inspired it to bring about its complete and perfect fulfilment. Secondly, the effectual power that is to secure the triumph of this kingdom is not of man but of God,—since we are taught to look to God in prayer for the exertion of his power, through the agencies he has appointed, namely, his word, his church, and his Spirit. Thirdly,—and to this lesson of the Lord's prayer, I must confine your thoughts for the few remaining moments of my address—the coming of the kingdom of God has been made dependent upon the prayers and labors of his people,—when he bids us pray "thy kingdom come," he intimates that our prayer shall ensure a blessing which otherwise would never be bestowed,—while he has ordained in his eternal purpose the certain triumph of his kingdom, he has ordained also that prayer shall be the intermediate agency through which that triumph shall be secured. That prayer which is the voice not of the lips but of the inner being, which is the expression of the permanent desires of the soul, which carries with it not only the heart's devotion but the self-sacrificing labors of the life—that prayer God has decreed shall be

the channel through which all blessing flows to the church and the world. While we admire the greatness of the divine plans and the certainty of their execution, let us remember that we can be no idle spectators of God's working,— a responsibility rests on us as vast as the interests at stake,— the honor of God and the salvation of a world are made to hang on the faithfulness and zeal of Christ's disciples,— the kingdom is near or far, just in proportion to the love and faith and prayerful toil of the church.

And the sooner we wake up to the fact that for all purposes of practical duty and privilege, *we* are the church of Christ, the better it will be for us, and the better for the kingdom. There is a mock-humility that shirks duty and stifles faith. Brethren of the Judson Society, this prayer, "thy kingdom come," is our trumpet-call to arms and to battle for the kingdom of God. Not one of us can truly pray "thy kingdom come," without giving himself body and soul to that work in which he can best promote the coming of the kingdom. By just so much as Christ has endowed us with native ability and with opportunities of culture, by just so much are strengthened his claims to the use of our gifts in the building-up of his sovereignty on earth. In this day when autos-da-fe have ceased and papal fulminations have lost their terror, in this day when the opposition of Satan is so exclusively intellectual, there is need, as never before, of educated talent in the ministry and church of Christ. To every young man entering upon life, the question ought to come: "How can I use my powers for God and the salvation of the world with greatest economy of force,— how can I most surely make every faculty and attainment bear directly upon the coming of the kingdom of God?" Be sure that Christ has portioned out, to each of us who are his followers, some share in the work he is accomplishing on earth. Seeking earnestly to know where our work lies, whether in secular or in sacred duties, at home or abroad, and falling in with the plan of Christ whenever it is made known to us, we may have the assurance and comfort, in labor, in suffering, and in death, that our lives have not been wasted in the service of the world, but have contributed, however humbly, to bring about

> "That one far off divine event
> To which the whole creation moves."

My brethren, the greatness and power of God and the majesty of his kingdom are revealed to us not to give us excuse for idleness, but to furnish incitement to arduous and self-forgetful labor. The certainty of triumph is the greatest stimulus to earnest warfare. The grandest victories for the truth which the world has seen have been gained by men who were strong in the thought of God's eternal purposes, and who found in Jehovah the motive power of their lives. When the Jewish people were enslaved under Antiochus Epiphanes, that monster of successful iniquity — so enslaved that the sacred Scriptures were a forbidden book which it was death to possess or read, and the statue of the heathen Jupiter was set up for worship in the plundered sanctuary of the temple — the Asamonean family, one reverend old man and five heroic sons, called upon the nation to rise for religion and freedom. Thousands gathered round them and vowed to "stand for the Law" till death. Upon the banner which was borne before the patriot host were inscribed those stirring Hebrew words from the book of Exodus: *Mi Camoka Baalim Jehovah?* "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods?"— and from the initial letters

of that inscription — "M," "C," "B" — the Maccabees took their name. The motto of their standard became the inspiration of their war for independence. Trusting as their ancestors did in the omnipotence of God, they were enabled to shake off the yoke of the oppressor and to lift the nation from lethargy and apostasy to a religious zeal which had been unknown for centuries. And the Maccabees themselves — what examples of splendid devotion to religion and country have they left to after ages! My brethren, God has revealed to us his power and purpose to set up his kingdom for this same end that we, like that Asamonean family, may call upon him for great and mighty things, and then, believing his word and promise, may undertake great things for his glory. Let us combine with the motto of the Maccabees, "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods?" that other motto of Paul's, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me," and then let us go forth to do battle for the kingdom of God.

To do battle till we die, or the kingdom fully come. No rest for the soldiers of the cross, till the enemy is ours. No halt to the advancing army, till the world is conquered for Christ. Though the standard-bearers fall, though the years glide by and yet the promised end seems far away, aye, though seeming defeat may cloud our banners, still let the sacramental host press on. For Christ never dies; Christ never desponds; Christ never is defeated; and the Spirit of Christ is the Spirit of the Church. In the days of Queen Elizabeth, when the Jesuits were essaying by every art to restore in England that reign of papal darkness which the rising sun of the Reformation had just turned to day, they entered into solemn vows, that so long as there was any one of them left for the gallows, the torture, or the dungeon, they would never cease their endeavors to set up the Catholic religion in that kingdom. That miscalled Society of Jesus has left to the church, the true Society of Jesus, an example in this regard, which if we do not follow, we are false to our vows, false to ourselves, false to humanity, and false to Christ our King. Rather shall we not follow it, concentrating every faculty and power upon the work of Christ, and resolving never for one moment to remit our toil till his supreme dominion is set up in every human heart? With the mighty noise of this conflict of the ages in our ears, with the looming grandeur of the throne of God before us, with the vast sweep of eternity for our dwelling-place, let us not give our lives to ease or to profit or to human fame, but to the end for which Christ lived, the end for which Christ died — the interests and the triumph of the kingdom of God. If we thus live and thus die, it will make little matter whether our names are honored on earth, — we shall have the honor that comes from God, and we shall reign with Christ forever and ever, — for the kingdom that comes from heaven, and that makes heaven on earth, shall end at last in heaven. But whether we be true subjects or not, whether we give our lives to the kingdom or not, the kingdom shall come. To those who welcome it and labor for it, it shall be a kingdom of eternal blessedness and glory, — but upon whomsoever this stone shall fall, it shall grind him to powder. Christ will subdue us by the might and loveliness of his grace if may be, but if not by his grace, yet still he will subdue us. For "at the name of Jesus, every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things in earth and things under the earth, and every tongue shall confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

XXXVI.

LEAVING THE NINETY AND NINE.*

The early Christians delighted to picture Christ as the Good Shepherd. In Tertullian's time, they painted him thus upon the cup used at the Lord's Supper; and, a little later, they lightened the gloom of the Catacombs by representations of one who had snatched the lost sheep from the lion's jaws, and who bore it back to the fold with rejoicing. Unlike many of the devices of ecclesiastical art, this one has full warrant in Scripture. The text tells the story more pathetically than any statue or fresco possibly can. The one sheep wandering from the rest, and unable of itself to find its way back to the fold; the shepherd taking no pleasure in the multitude of his flock that feed unharmed about him, so long as that one erring one is exposed to death; the girding of himself for his departure, and the long, anxious search over the dark mountains for the lost; the perseverance that gives itself no rest until he finds it, even though the shepherd's feet and hands are pierced with bitter thorns along the way; the joy of the return, when he brings back upon his shoulders the rescued one, who even now has not strength enough to walk alone,—these are features of the parable that touch our inmost hearts. But, of all the strokes that give impressiveness and pathos to the picture, I know of none so masterly and so divine as the question: "Doth he not leave the ninety and nine?"

There have been many interpretations of it. The ancient expositors saw in it an allusion to that condescension of the eternal Son which led him to leave the many mansions of his Father's house on high, with their myriads of unfallen intelligences, that he might quench his light in the darkness of this little sphere, and so restore this one wandering world to its true place in the great system of God. There were ninety and nine loyal planets that revolved around the central sun. But one had forgotten its allegiance, and had shot off like a comet into the distant night. He who once spoke them all into being now follows, and from the very night of death recovers the one lost world by passing into that night of death himself. In modern times, we have been accustomed to apply the parable, not to the one world that is lost, while the many races of God's great universe still render joyful obedience, but to the one soul that has gone astray, and has become a prey to Satan. What does it matter to the tender Shepherd that such a multitude are safe within the fold, so long as one poor sinner is involved in the misery and guilt of sin, and is in danger of everlasting death? To bring one such sinner back, he thinks it none too great a sacrifice to lay down his life.

*A sermon before the American Baptist Missionary Union, at its annual meeting, Indianapolis, May 22, 1881, on the text, Mat. 18:12—"Doth he not leave the ninety and nine?"

These are the common interpretations. I make no doubt that both of them are true. There is a principle here that may have great variety of application. It is the principle that the weakest, the most needy, the most miserable, are in a true sense nearest to the Savior's heart. His compassion is measured only by the depth of man's want. And so I bring you still another interpretation of the parable, equally true with the others, this, namely: That Christ yearns over the heathen more than he does over the Christian lands, and that his Spirit moves the church to leave the ninety and nine that are safe within the fold of Christendom, and to go out after those who are perishing in their pagan depravity and wretchedness, until she find them, and bring them back to God.

I am well aware that such an application as this runs directly counter to the current of popular opinion in our day. Modern objections to missions have changed their form; but they are more subtle, and with a large class of persons they are more powerful than ever before. Christian people feel them, even if they do not urge them. We do not deny the needs of the heathen, nor the duty of evangelizing the world. But we are inclined to choose our methods, and to consult the natural laws of civilization and progress, more than we consult the commission of Christ and the promise of his Spirit. We are bidden to distinguish between the advancing and the decaying races, and to confine our efforts to those which still have stamina and inherent powers of growth. What hope, we are asked, what hope of permanent success among a people already on the verge of extinction, like the North American Indians, or dying of their vices, like the islanders of the South Seas? Of what use was it for John Eliot to give his life to translating the Bible into an Indian tongue, when there does not now remain a single living Indian who can read it? Tribes without a history are not worth the saving, say the critics. The stuff is too soft to take a stamp, or to give a stamp to others. The Hottentots of Africa are of as little account, so far as mental vigor and influence upon the world are concerned, as the swarming ants of one of their own ant-hills; and there have not been wanting philosophers who could coolly say that we should do with them just what we do with an ant-hill,— namely, stamp on them, and stamp them out of existence.

This reasoning is supported, moreover, by an appeal to apostolic labors. The first disciples did not scatter themselves among the Gentiles, we are told: they were commanded to tarry at Jerusalem, the central stronghold of Judaism. Then they seized upon Antioch, the great commercial entrepot between East and West. Paul did not waste his time in country towns. He betook himself to Ephesus and Corinth, as strategic points from which whole provinces might be invaded and subdued. He garrisoned the capitals for Christ, and trusted that from them the gospel would move upon the great outlying regions which they commanded. In fact, nothing would satisfy him but to preach the gospel at Rome. He would make the masters of the world acknowledge the mastership of Christ, knowing that, when the strength of Rome had enlisted under the Savior's banner, the weaker nations would follow her lead. So our new guides would have us devote ourselves to the strong races. Preach the gospel to the Caucasian, who has mind enough to appreciate it and force enough to propagate it. Be sure not to underrate

the Anglo-Saxon race, and that special portion of it which we ourselves represent. In short, American soil furnishes the proper field for the gospel. If you would reach other nations, you will find the best specimens of them here. God has sifted the races of the earth and brought the *élite* of them all to our shores. We can best evangelize China, by preaching to the Chinese in California; Africa, by teaching the negroes at the South; Germany, by missions among the Germans of Milwaukee and Kansas. Do your foreign work at home. Educate and Christianize yourselves; and, by the same rule, confine your chief attention to the most promising classes within your own borders. Aim at the talent and culture of the land. Let the degraded and the ignorant die out, or at least shift for themselves. The best way to pervade a nation with truth and righteousness, is to raise up an intellectual and spiritual aristocracy. Not a farthing-candle in myriads of houses, but the kindling here and there of electric lamps that shall shine like suns. So to him that hath shall be given, and from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

It is, of course, a *reductio ad absurdum;* but, since many of these notions are prevalent, and wherever they prevail are paralyzing missionary zeal, it may be well to consider carefully the grain of truth that is in them, and also the deadly error. The element of truth is simply this: God's providential arrangement of nations, and of influential centres in those nations, is to be consulted in our evangelistic plans. Other things being equal, it is a duty to avail ourselves of the natural currents of commerce and literature, to seize upon political strongholds, and upon the strong men who offer themselves for the service of the gospel. The field is the world, and the world includes America as well as Hindustan. There are many sorts of places, for many sorts of men. Some are as truly called to serve Christ at home as others are to serve him abroad. There are talents and endowments which distinctly mark men for work of teaching and leadership in this land. There are tasks and impulses which as distinctly mark men for pioneer enterprises in Africa, or for Bible translation in China. Then, too, we must go wherever we can go. God opens the door, and we must enter it. We must follow in the line of geographical exploration, and tread the highways of commerce. We owe more to Africa, than we did before Livingston had reached Lake Nyassa, and Stanley had traced the course of the Congo. Fifty years ago, we might have been better pardoned for not attempting missions to Japan, than now, when the ancient wall of Japanese exclusiveness is beaten down. And so with regard to castes and classes. We must take what God sends. If he will not first give us access to the proud and cultivated Burman, we must welcome the conversion of the Karens. If the Telugu Brahmins will not embrace the gospel, thousands of the Pariahs will. We must work in the line of God's providences, remembering that there is a supernatural element in missions, and a wisdom not of this world, which chooses the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and weak things of this world to confound the mighty, and base things of this world, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are, that no flesh should glory in his presence.

So we may answer objectors to our plan of distant work among races and classes that do not lead the van of civilization,— answer them by saying that

we are men under authority, with marching orders to go into all the world, to enter every open door, to preach to every creature who is willing to hear, trusting results to him who sends us. But there is much more than this to be said. I wish to show not only that we must do this, but that we ought to do it; not only that God has shut us up to this course, but that his ways are justifiable even to human reason. In place of the policy of repression and confinement — what we may call the dark-lantern theory of missions, the keeping of our light to ourselves, concentration of effort upon the favored and the strong — I urge the leaving of the ninety and nine, and the seeking out of the weak and the lost. And this for four reasons: first, that *this is the irrepressible instinct of Christian love.* You cannot narrow down its regards, if you would. Love is not calculating. It does not bargain for just so much success in its efforts, before it will put them forth. It does not graduate itself by the present worth, but only by the present need, of its object. Self-interest and self-gratulation work in order to get, love works in order to give. Its natural impulse is toward the weakest. The true mother will love most of all the child that is deformed or blind,—ay, strange to say, the gleams of sense that now and then cross the mental darkness of her half-idiotic boy will waken thrills of sympathetic and compassionate joy in that mother's heart, that she never feels at the triumphs of her gifted sons. And to say that Christian love has like feelings toward the outcast and those for whom no others care, is only to say that it is love. What! let the illiterate and the drunkard go their way, because the educated and the temperate are so much more worthy of our efforts? Ah, that is just what Christian love cannot do! The ignorant and the self-despairing shall be the very objects of the Christian's regard.

That was a very safe test by which Professor Tyndall proposed to gauge the results of prayer. The whole Christian world were invited to concentrate their petitions upon one ward of a certain hospital, while they left the other wards unprayed for. Then it could be ascertained whether prayer accomplished anything. Professor Tyndall forgot that the thought of that ward for which nobody cared would set thousands of Christian people praying for its inmates, so that the proposed test would test nothing. Paul does not graduate his love for his converts by the love he gets from them in return. He will love them the more, the less he is loved. No — we might as well acknowledge it — Christian love is very different from mere prudence. Its very essence is self-sacrifice. It lives by dying, as Christ did. In fact, Christian love is nothing but the Christ in us, repeating his disinterested devotion of himself to the uplifting of the fallen and the rescue of the lost.

Missions to the inert and degraded races, then, are not a hard compulsion put upon the church,—they are a carrying out of the inmost impulse of the Christian heart. Morrison thanks God when he is sent to China, because he considers it an answer to his prayer for a place to work where the needs are the greatest, and where, regarded from a human point of view, there is least chance of success. Is this wisdom? Still, I maintain that it is; and I urge, as a second reason for leaving the ninety and nine, that *this has proved historically to be the method of success.* The beginnings of Christianity were not in a growing nation, nor among the Caucasian race. It was among the Semitic stock, and in an Asiatic land, that its preparation and

inception took place. The Jew seemed to have run his course, and to have succumbed to the common fate of Orientals — political despotism, physical stagnation, intellectual bigotry. "*Credat Judæus Apella*" indicated the narrow credulity everywhere attributed to him. He had had no king of his own race for five centuries. Rome had put her foot upon his neck. The conquering race was at the West. The Cæsars had come, and the world was bowing beneath their sway. Where shall Christianity inaugurate her mission? Surely, it will be in the emperor's palace, or at least under the shadow of the Capitoline Hill. But no, it is to a continent from which the rod of empire has forever passed away, to a race that is to make no more figure in political history, to a people enslaved and scattered, to a town that has become a by-word and a hissing, that Jesus comes to begin his redeeming work. He passes by Rome, and he begins at Nazareth. He leaves the advancing, and he takes the decaying, race. From that race of Jews he chooses his apostles — yes, his chiefest apostles, — so that Paul becomes the apostle of the Gentiles, and Peter comes to be the patron saint of Rome. The Jew conquers the Roman; the decaying race subdues its masters.

Was there cold-blooded neglect of the insignificant country towns, in the apostolic labors? What were Derbe and Iconium and Lystra but rude, provincial places, with a heathenish jargon of a language which the apostles could not understand? Did Paul stop with Rome, or did he go, after his first imprisonment, to the regions beyond? Surely, the perils of robbers and of the deep, through which he passed, were not all incurred in civilized lands. And why is it that we know so little of the labors of the eleven apostles? No answer can be given but this: Their lives were missionary lives, spent in comparative obscurity for the most part, and the record of them written, not on earth, but on high. So Christianity made its beginnings. And so has been its subsequent history. Where should we be, in the scale of civilization or religion to-day, if Augustine, the Roman abbot in the sixth century, had confined his Christian zeal to efforts in behalf of the ruling race, instead of undertaking that mission to Britain and to those barbarous English ancestors of ours? Thirteen hundred years of history have justified that leaving of the ninety and nine, to whom belonged the strength and culture of the world, and that seeking after the sheep that were lost. Christianity has recreated that English race, and has given it an empire more noble and spiritual than Rome ever knew. And now, when missions have made us what we are, shall we turn coldly away from the nations which stand where we then stood? I know that it takes time to work these wonders. "Providence," it has been said, "moves through time as the gods of Homer moved through space: it takes one step, and ages have passed away." The gospel can recreate nations, as well as individuals; but in the lifetime of a nation, not in the lifetime of an individual, shall the change be wrought. Let us give God time to show what he can do. The single century of modern missions affords but small basis for a theory which contradicts nineteen hundred years of history and the teaching of the whole word of God.

I advocate the opposite theory of missions — the theory of leaving the strong and going out after the weak — upon the ground, thirdly, that *this best accords with the great doctrinal truth of the unity and solidarity*

of the race. God has made of one blood all nations. They are bound together by a common descent from the first Adam, but equally by a common relationship to the second Adam, who joined himself to humanity to save it. Sin is self-isolating, and ignores this relationship. Christ's spirit gives us the feeling of brotherhood once more. Sin says, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Christ's spirit says, "I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians." Sin looks upon mankind as segregated atoms, disconnected individuals. The spirit of Christ regards humanity as an organism, pervaded with one life. Sin counts as foreigners and enemies all who are not demonstrably of our particular family. The spirit of Christ sees in every Greenlander a soul for which the Redeemer died, and in the Malayan and Patagonian, members of a common humanity with ourselves — a humanity capable of indefinite progress, and with such claims upon our sympathy and help, that for them we should be willing to lay down our lives. See what provision God has made for breadth, as well as for intensity, in our missionary zeal. We are guarded against apathy by the thought that each single soul has in it capacities of infinite expansion. We are guarded against narrowness by the thought that every such soul is only the infinitesimal part of a grander unity. The greatness of the race looms up before us; the mass of its guilt and degradation appals us; we see what crushed the soul of Christ in Gethsemane and broke his heart on Calvary. As we get nearer to Christ in our personal experience, the sense of this oneness grows upon us, until we see that all the nations together constitute the humanity which he died to save.

Away then with that proud idolatry of race which would count the Anglo-Saxon only as the elect of God! Humanity is greater than we know. There are many aspects of the rounded sphere. Races come and go in history. Greek beauty and Roman organization have had their day. How do we know that the constitutional freedom of the Anglo-Saxon shall be more lasting? The newly emerging civilization of the Sandwich Islands, and the presence of the negro in the United States Senate chamber, show that there are capacities not yet developed, nations yet to come to the front. The Book of Revelation assures us that on the head of the conquering Christ there are to be many crowns. Many nations shall call him Lord. The new song of redeemed humanity shall be, not a song of one part only, which all shall sing in unison, but a song of many parts, each transformed race and tribe and kindred and nation of men furnishing its peculiar and inimitable and indispensable element in the grand harmony. We have no more right to despair of a nation, than we have to despair of an individual. God is able to turn back the tide of corruption in a nation, as well as in an individual, and begin a new development, as at the Reformation. So shall they "build the old wastes: they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations." As we see in every human soul the possibilities of kingship and priesthood to God, so let us see in every tribe upon the footstool the possibilities of an illimitable progress in intellectual and spiritual power, and all tending to the triumphs of that day when the philosophic mind of the Orient and the practical vigor of the West shall in all their phases and varieties be given to Christ. Is no other race valuable but ours? Ah! the race most desperately sunk in super-

stition and idolatry to-day may in the long to-morrow place the brightest crown of all upon the brow of the Redeemer. We are bound to leave the ninety and nine, and go out after the benighted races, because humanity everywhere is one, and the work of the church is nothing less than to bring this whole humanity to the feet of its common Lord.

But I argue this view, fourthly, from the poor economical consideration that, *only as we thus in utter self-abandonment seek the salvation of the lowest and worst abroad, can we reach the highest and the best in character and activity at home.* Here is the Christian paradox: "Give, if you would get; scatter, if you would increase; die, if you would live." Christ followed this rule, leaving heaven for earth, and conquering through death. And he came to diffuse his spirit through humanity. He did not point to his miracles as furnishing the chief evidence that he came from God. The blind were made to see, and the deaf to hear, indeed; demons were cast out, and the dead were raised. But the climax was this: the poor have the gospel preached to them. With a divine radicalism, Christianity goes down to the deepest depth of human corruption and guilt, and, putting its mighty shoulders of love under the whole mass of man's shame and sin, lifts it up to purity and to God. Christianity works from below, upward. Only the self-devotion that is willing to give its efforts in behalf of the meanest will ever succeed in reaching the noblest, and in general it will reach the influential and the rich only after it has proved its disinterestedness by laboring for the weak and the poor. I speak of course not of a mock gospel that gathers people of wealth and fashion into places of show, and dignifies its altar-parades with the name of worship. I speak of the real conversion of the rich to Christ. That, you may be sure, never takes place under the ministry of those whose aim is simply to bring riches into the church, but only as the result of labor for the souls of men, irrespective of their temporal station. And so, seeking the lost abroad is the best means of stirring up effort at home.

I do not know when Christ will come. I do not know whether the preaching of the gospel in all the world which is to precede his coming involves the hearing of it by every human being individually, or by each nation in the mass. But this I do know,—that the preaching of the gospel, which shall usher in the time of the end, will be a heart-service, on the part of the church, which shall labor by preference for the most desolate and down-trodden portions of mankind. What Christ wants is the throwing of ourselves into the breach,—not the quantitative estimate of our work, but the qualitative,—not how many have been won, but how much has been sacrificed. God has justified many an enterprise that seemed absolutely foolhardy. The forlorn hope has often turned the tide of battle. Do not think that such victories abroad will ever involve loss at home. The reflex influence of them upon Christian character in Christian lands is worth all the cost. The sufferings of the Judsons at Oung-Pen-La have added heroism to thousands of Christian hearts in America, that could have been stirred in no other way so well. Let us remember that our Home Mission Societies trace their descent from the Foreign, and not the Foreign from the Home. It is my firm conviction that if every Christian preacher should go abroad, and the whole Christian church should precipitate itself upon heathendom as in the

days of the Crusades Europe precipitated itself upon Asia, there not only would be no ultimate loss, but the home field would flourish as never before, — aye, the mighty angel of the Apocalypse would soon bind Satan, and the millennial era dawn. I counsel no fanaticism. I recognize the fact that Providence puts obstacles in the way of some, which it would be criminal to disregard. But the danger of our day is not the danger of overstrained enthusiasm: it is the danger of self-indulgence and of unconscientiousness. We need the rousing of the martyr-spirit once more; the resurrection of the church to a new life, of which we read in the twentieth chapter of the book of Revelation; the choosing of the hard instead of the easy; the leaving of the ninety and nine, for whom others will care, and the going out into the wilderness after the lost. In this course lies the only safety of the church; for the church as well as for the individual it is true, that whosoever will save his life shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his life for Christ's sake shall find it.

Thus I have urged upon you a theory of missions which human wisdom would never have suggested, but which, when once acted upon, proves itself to be the wisdom of God. I have urged the undertaking of the difficult, the seeking of the far away, the rescue of the tribes and the men that are vile and ready to die. I have urged this upon the ground: first, that this is the irrepressible instinct of Christian love; secondly, that this is proved historically to be the method of success; thirdly, that this best accords with the great doctrinal truth of the unity and solidarity of the race; and, fourthly, that only this method will secure the highest development of Christian character and activity at home. But there is a sublimer and more conclusive reason still, — it is the fifth and last that I shall mention: *this plan is the plan that gives most glory to Christ, our Redeemer and our King.* That which most reveals Christ most glorifies him; for to glorify him is nothing more nor less than to make known his glory. This plan of missions most glorifies Christ, because it most closely follows the method of his own work as our Redeemer; it most absolutely casts itself upon his power and promise as our King. Why does not Christ hasten his coming and his kingdom? Why do the isles yet wait for his law? Why has Calvin's motto, *Domine, quousque?* — "O Lord, how long?" — been for so many centuries the cry of the church? The heart of God yearns over the apostate race. Surely there must be yet some obstacle to his bestowal of full favor upon it. Do you say that the atonement of Christ removed that obstacle forever? Yes, so far as to make it consistent with his holiness to give pardon to the penitent. But he has power to make men penitent. Why does he not more widely and gloriously exert that power? I know of no answer but this: It is his purpose to join the church with Christ in this great work of saving men; and the full tide of grace is restrained, and God will not assume his full dominion in the earth, until his people shall present themselves as free-will offerings to his service.

Brethren, in our weak fear of anthropomorphic representations of God, let us not deny that God has a heart, and that that heart is moved by the sacrifices and the deaths of his servants. Why, the ungodly world is moved by them! When it sees that missionary mother, kneeling on a heathen strand

and gazing with straining eyes upon the vanishing ship that takes her children from her forever, and then hears her cry with uplifted hands, "This I do for thee, Lord Jesus!" there is something in that more than martyr-like self sacrifice that touches its heart also. The proud, hard, cold world is made to feel, when it sees Christ evidently crucified before it, in the uncompromising and unsparing self-sacrifice of his followers. So Christ, lifted up in the self-devotion of Christians, shall draw all men unto him. But, if the church's love for souls touches the heart even of the ungodly world, how it must move the heart of God! He sees in it the reflection and reproduction of that love which led his Son to leave his bosom, and to endure even his forsaking. He sees in it the entrance of his redeemed people upon his own divine work of healing and salvation. It is the one way by which the church can reveal the mind and heart of God, and so make known his glory. And so the world shall not be brought back to God, until we who love him fill up that which is behind of the sufferings of Christ, for his body's sake, which is the church. Thus, suffering with him, we shall reign with him, and shall be partakers in his saving power. So, working greater spiritual wonders in the regeneration of men than even Christ wrought when he was here in the flesh, we shall hasten the coming of the day of God.

The choosing of the dark places of the earth and the habitations of cruelty as fields for missionary effort gives most glory to Christ, not only because it most closely follows his own method as our Redeemer, but also because it most absolutely casts itself upon his power and promise as our King. To go alone to a tribe of cannibals; to attack single-handed a vast and hoary system of organized idolatry; "in the unresistible might of weakness," to brave the violence and hatred of a despotic error that counts a hundred millions as its slaves,—this is to testify faith in a living and omnipotent Christ; this is to find the strength for Christian work, not in man, but in Him who sitteth upon the throne; this is to make the method of our work, as well as our work itself, contribute to the glory of him "of whom, and through whom, and to whom, are all things." When the church shall give herself to the work of men's salvation, and, trusting only in God's power, shall hurl herself upon the stoutest and most bitter of God's foes, then God can have the glory, then God will begin to work as the world has never seen him work, then the Messenger of the covenant shall suddenly come to the defiled and ruined temple of humanity, then the darkness shall give place to light, and the glories of the latter day begin to dawn.

I remember some years ago pressing my way up a remote and desolate Swiss valley, till I reached almost the boundary of everlasting snow. Gradually, the sky darkened, and a hurricane of wind and rain swept down from the glaciers. The roaring of the mountain-torrents and the crashing of the storm seemed almost to betoken the breaking-up of the foundations of the world. It was as if night had suddenly set in, and as if we, wrapped in clouds and darkness, were being seized and hurried away from a dissolving universe. Then, just as I was about to despair of safety, the dense black veil of driving cloud and storm parted in an instant, and through the rift there shone down upon me the vision of a dazzling mountain-peak of snow, serene in sunshine, against a sky of cloudless blue; around, the furious,

hellish rush of dark and blinding and contending elements; above, the majesty of a spotless purity, and the beauty of an ineffable calm. So the power of God will be made known to the church and to the generation that seeks his glory through the dark path of self-sacrificing devotion to the fallen and the lost. May God give us all this spirit, whether we go beyond the sea or stay with the ninety and nine at home! So shall the time come when the sign of the Son of Man shall indeed appear in the heavens, when Christ shall come in power and great glory, when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ!

XXXVII.

THE ECONOMICS OF MISSIONS.*

It is now three score years and ten since the beginning of our American Baptist missionary operations. During these seventy years, the executive work of our Missionary Union has been conducted with an unsurpassed faithfulness and wisdom; its income has gradually increased from a few hundreds to over three hundred thousand dollars yearly; and greater results in the conversion of men to God have attended the labors of our missionaries, than any other society can show. We attribute this, not to any devotion or zeal of ours, but to the special favor of God. Yet it would be uncandid if we did not say that, in our judgment, this success has been to some extent also attributable to the fact that our theory and method of missionary work have been, more nearly than those of other denominations, conformed to the model set for us in the New Testament. We trust that model still, and we expect further and larger successes to demonstrate that it comes to us from God.

Yet the apparent exigencies of particular times and situations endanger our faithfulness, and tempt us to ignore this model. The distance of the foreign field, and our comparative unfamiliarity with it, make us willing to accept excuses for an exceptional conduct of affairs there, which we should not be willing to allow at home. It has seemed to me that this is a favorable time to consider in a broad way the economics of missionary effort, by which I mean, not economics in the narrow sense of financial economy or saving, but economics in the larger etymological sense of administration or management,— in other words, the principles of Christianity, of our denominational faith, and of business procedure, which lie at the basis of foreign missionary work, and by which it should be regulated. We are only at the beginning of that work. The world stretches out before us, waiting for our coming. The resources now at our disposal are very small, compared with those which the Spirit of God will in the future move his church to give. It is a matter of vast importance that we settle now upon a right theory in the establishment of missions, and upon right methods in their management. An error here, though it may seem a slight one, will be found, like an error in fundamental astronomical measurements, to multiply itself on and on indefinitely, until incalculable and irremediable evil finally results.

Let me begin by mentioning certain principles which seem to me broadly and distinctively Christian. One is this: Seek by preference the degraded and the weak. God has taught us a lesson during these last seventy years, this namely, that the needy are the most accessible to the gospel, and that, when once won to Christ, they make the best propagators of it. Chris-

*An address before the Baptist Congress, Brooklyn, Nov. 14, 1882.

tian economics are not the economics of this world. They are the economics of love and the economics of faith. And they justify themselves by the result, for God is in them. The mission to the Burmans, inaugurated by the heroism and devotion of the Judsons, after all these seventy years of labor, has made but little inroad upon that proud and ancient system of heathenism. But the mission to the Karens, a subject and almost a servile race, has been blessed more than any other mission of modern times, until the Burmans are beginning to ask what power this is that is lifting their old foot-balls and drudges up above themselves. When Mr. and Mrs. Clough tried to teach men of caste, their progress was slow and disheartening. When they received the Pariahs, the tide turned and converts came in like a flood. In England to-day the greatest successes of Christianity are found in high-church missions to the degraded classes of London, and in the multitudes of conversions that have followed the work of the Salvation Army. These things, and not the preaching of St. Paul's and the West End, are ringing through the Reviews, challenging the attention of scientific men, and proving that the gospel is not dead, but is still the power of God. And one of the noblest signs of life in our American Christianity is the revived interest in city missions that is felt among our churches, and the disposition to give liberal support to evangelizing efforts in the neglected quarters of New York. God bless these efforts, and make them a new demonstration of the great principle of missionary economics, that our first duty is to the weak, and that through the weak we best reach the strong!

Our first duty,— but not our only duty. To say that we will give the gospel only to the poor, is to forget that the rich have souls as well as they. To say that the intellectual and refined are beyond us, is to deny the divinity and power of Christ. God leads certain detachments of his army against the very strongholds of the enemy — strongholds that are to be captured, not by sudden onset, but by long siege. A second important principle of missionary economics is that of — Persistent reinforcement of missions once begun,— at least until Christianity is embodied in vigorous working churches. We must remember that we have to deal with peoples, who, having lost the knowledge of the true God, have also lost all confidence in man,— peoples who regard the male missionary as a commercial speculator or a political emmisary, and the female unmarried missionary as simply a concubine. The very idea of disinterested love has never dawned upon them, — it must be created from nothing,— only time will do the work. Mere preaching is not enough,— that is counted as so much "talk,"— and the use of language, in heathendom, is not to express, but to conceal, one's meaning. What is needed is the slow demonstration of character, the exhibition of a Christian life, works of helpfulness and mercy, the gospel embodied in pity and love for the hardened and the lost. This at length moves the heart. Judson waited seven years for his first convert,— but the convert came. And when a hundred were gathered in a Christian church, his prophetic eye saw the work as if it were done,— Satan had fallen from heaven. The very lack of individuality among the heathen, which at first seems such a hindrance to their conversion, may prove an ultimate advantage,— for, let movement once begin, and the organic unity of family, caste, race, will send impressions through millions, and the massing of their force will be irresistible. We bless

God now that we never gave up the mission to the Telugus. Let us never give up the mission to Siam. Let our second principle be Reinforcement, but never surrender.

A third principle,— Evangelization before education or civilization. The truth is, you cannot educate or civilize to any good purpose, unless Christianizing has gone before. The English missionaries to the North American Indians began by providing homes for them, but the Indians did not want the homes,— they preferred the filth and squalor of their old life. Only as Christian influences taught them their spiritual needs, did they seek improvement of their outward condition. Some early Telugu missionary imported a case of shoes, to cover the feet of the bare-footed Hindus. History does not relate what became of them,— but it is certain that the Telugus did not wear them. There are grave difficulties connected with the plan of lay-missionaries, or of colonies of Christian tradesmen. Among the Hindus, caste prohibits the employing of any but hereditary mechanics and artisans. Christian tradesmen could not find employment enough to keep them from starvation. The English Government is doing more to improve the farming of the natives, than any missionary society possibly could. Experimental farms are supported and fitted up with the best modern appliances; the natives have seen these in operation for years; and yet, before the famine of 1877–78, only seventy-five steel ploughs in all had been sold to native farmers in the whole Madras Presidency. Nor are medical missionaries so much needed. All the stations in the Telugu mission, except Ramapatam, have near them a free medical dispensary and hospital, in charge either of an English surgeon or of a competent apothecary; and, up to the close of the famine, missionaries not located in such stations received free grants of medicines from the government, on application through a Collector. It may be doubted, indeed, whether a large amount of medical knowledge is not a hindrance, more than a help, to the work of the missionary. If he make a pecuniary charge for his services, his medical work ceases to be a matter of pure benevolence and an argument for Christianity; if he gives his services gratuitously, the crowds that come to him for merely physical relief prevent his giving any proper attention to the work of preaching.

The gospel does not need education to precede it, any more than it needs civilization or general philanthropy. Schools come after preaching, both in time and importance. When the mind is waked up by conversion, there is an eager desire to know the truth. Individual reformations, like the great Reformation in Germany, are followed by a mighty quickening of thought, and an advance in intelligence. But education will not make men Christians. It may only make them more accomplished and successful opposers of the truth. The merely secular gain derivable from an education furnishes a great motive to heathen young men to enter our mission schools. Once in these schools, their sole desire is to pass the examinations, and to fit themselves for government service, or for other remunerative employment. Mr. Bainbridge tells of a graduate of the Duff College, at Calcutta, who could speak twelve languages, but who declared that there was nothing so detestable to him as Christianity. Our missionaries say that some of the worst heathen they have to do with, the most sceptical, dishonorable and troublesome to native Christians, are those who have studied in Mission Schools.

The schools of which I speak were not schools of our own denomination; but, if I am not mistaken, there is a tendency toward mere secular education among our own missions, and against it these facts ought to warn us. The third principle of our missionary economics should be: Education and civilization subsequent, and auxiliary, to the preaching of the gospel, and schools not secular, but Christian.

But I must pass to consider certain principles which are distinctively Baptist. And the first of them is this: Converts should without unnecessary delay be gathered into churches large enough to give some sense of companionship and strength, but small enough to permit of effective self-government. Here there is great need of a uniform method of procedure conformed to our denominational theory. We must not judge too harshly the short-comings of our missionaries when they are pressed with labors connected with a great revival. But we may certainly urge the importance of right beginnings in the evangelization of a great people, and no beginnings are right which do not result in the formation of effective working churches. On the one hand, converts should not be kept in large bodies, so scattered and unwieldy that they can hardly be called by the name of churches, and lacking in proper officers, discipline, and benevolent activities; nor, on the other hand, should these converts be organized into extremely small bodies, so weak that they cannot sustain themselves, and must soon die out.

The neglect properly to organize converts into churches must always increase the tendency to an Episcopal system of government. The representatives of other denominations declare indeed that every missionary is virtually a bishop, overseeing the native ministers. "Here," says Dr. Mullens, "is a practical New Testament Episcopate, sprung not from theory, but from circumstances; an Episcopate forced on men of all churches — Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Wesleyans, and Lutherans." I I do not find that he added, Baptists, but we need to be careful lest we be classed with the rest. In theory, we hold to a congregational church government. We believe that the apostles left no successors; that no minister has the right to exercise lordship over God's heritage; that there is no authority on earth superior to the body of believers. And to these principles we ought everywhere and at all hazards to conform.

There is great reason to believe that the seeming necessity of ministerial authority over mission converts in the first centuries of Christianity was one of the chief occasions of the rise of the whole hierarchical and papal system. In theory, we protest against every such perversion of the ministerial office. We hold that Christ is the only Lord; that every Christian has a direct relation to Christ, as Sovereign and Lawgiver.

But it is certain that even among us there are men who, whether serving at home or abroad, never overcome their propensity to look down upon the Christians to whom they minister. It is certain that even among us there is a tendency on the part of missionaries to become bishops. I know that, after a great ingathering of converts, time is required to teach them their various duties, and that such converts are very immature and unused to self government. They will make mistakes, and those mistakes will sometimes be attended with serious loss. But this is not an argument against Baptist polity, but an urgent reason for it. As Macaulay has said: "The remedy

for the evils of liberty is — liberty." The heathen convert must *learn* independence, by *using* his independence. Congregational church government, like democratic municipal government, is itself an education and a school. To keep converts under the control of the missionary, instead of letting them govern themselves, is to condemn them to perpetual childhood, to repeat the error of Rome, to forsake the fundamental tenet of Baptist polity, to endanger the whole future of our work.

From American Baptists who have had prolonged acquaintance with our mission in France, I have gained the impression that the slow progress of our work in that country is in large measure due to the lack of understanding, on the part of our missionary pastors, of the meaning and the working of the congregational principle. In a country so long monarchical, the methods of liberty are very hard to learn. The pastor and the missionary find it much easier to govern a church themselves, than to teach it the art of self-government. There is much ignorance with regard to Baptist polity.

There is much misapprehension, both at home and abroad, with regard to the real office of the missionary. The missionary is not a bishop. Still less is the missionary an apostle. The missionary is simply an evangelist. He has no authority, except that which belongs to every Christian preacher who is deputed by the church to which he belongs at home to go out to labor in new fields. His business is not to impose his own law, but to teach Christ's law,— not to govern the churches he gathers, but to teach them to govern themselves. And from this follows the second Baptist principle in the economics of missions. It is this : The churches gathered from among the heathen should at once be taught the duty of self-support and of self-propagation. The missionary's relation to them is not a permanent one. He thoroughly succeeds, only as he makes his converts able to get along without him. You can test his work best by asking, not how they do while he is with them, but how they do after he has left them. Does he teach his converts to provide for themselves, and then to provide for others? After their long centuries of oppression, heathen races are naturally servile. They look up to the missionary, as a superior being. His word is law. It is not well for him to be fellow-member in a native church. It is not well for him to be director and guide of any single church, longer than is absolutely necessary. The church will never form the habit of self-dependence, if the necessity of it is delayed too long. Even the apostles speedily transferred pastoral duties from themselves to their converts. However much these converts wished to retain them, they hasted away to regions beyond, commending the churches to God and to the word of his grace, which was able to keep them from falling.

Dr. L. W. Bacon speaks well of "the necessity of a double faith — the faith which lays the original foundation, and the faith that leaves the native churches when the time has come, to self-direction and self-support, as Paul left the elders at Miletus, though he knew that grievous wolves would enter in, not sparing the flock." If there is any one thing which our missionaries and which Christians at home need to unlearn, it is their disposition to keep the mission churches under perpetual tutelage ; to distrust the permanency of the new seed of the divine life implanted in a heathen's soul ; or, which is the same thing, to doubt the wisdom of Christ in instituting a self-governing church, and the power of Christ to make that church self-supporting.

No man ever knows what he can do, until he is put to the test. No manhood can exist without the bearing of responsibility. And therefore we ought not only to teach our mission churches from the outset the duty of self-support, but after a reasonable time we ought to withdraw to other fields and leave them to support themselves or die. They will *not* die, if we leave them. They *will* die, of feebleness, if we do not. It is worthy of serious question whether our mission to the Karens has not reached a point where the best service we could render it would be to leave it to itself. Let the Theological Seminary remain, but let American preachers withdraw. And with all the abundant cause for gratitude among the Telugus, it is also a serious question whether the small rate of increase in native contributions during the past few years does not indicate a lack of instruction on this fundamental point, as well as over-slowness in organizing the converts into self-governing churches.

My brethren, it is the greatest of mistakes to do everything for our converts. They become convinced that missionaries, and those who send them, are very rich, that they are "their father and mother," and that they themselves need do, and need give, nothing. Dr. Anderson, of the American Board, never wrote a truer line than when he declared that "the self-supporting principle, in all its applications, needs an unsleeping guardianship and culture. The native churches, like young children, prefer things to be done for them. A wise missionary, and the Society which sustains him, should therefore from the outset resist the tendency which most missions show to perpetuate the dependent system." And Dr. Anderson is unquestionably right. Sooner or later that system must be given up in every field where missions have had success. India must have its own type of Christianity, and of preaching, and of church life. China can never be evangelized by a handful of foreigners. The main preaching in foreign lands must be done by native preachers who can speak with an idiomatic freshness, with a force of familiar illustration, and with a sympathy of race and manners, such as no American can ever attain. And, therefore, the missionary must not simply preach himself,— he must organize and direct the labors of others, showing them how, laying the burden upon them, and finally leaving them to support and to extend the gospel that has saved them, with the Holy Spirit for their only helper and the word of God for their only guide.

And now, finally, let me set before you two principles of missionary economics, which may properly be called business principles, as those I have mentioned were respectively Christian and Baptist. The first has reference to the relations between the Executive Committee of the Missionary Union and the missionaries whom it appoints and maintains. This committee should insist that all applicants for appointment to the foreign field should be not only persons of sound health, of well balanced mind, and of proved practical devotion — patient, self-reliant, successful, in Christian work at home — but also that they should possess something of linguistic ability, and that this ability should have been sharpened and developed by thorough training in the schools. The day has gone by when men should be sent abroad who have not mind enough, nor persistence enough, to go through a complete course of preparatory education. No student should be taken from a Theological Seminary, before has he finished his full three years of work. No

man who cannot learn Latin or Greek should be thought capable of mastering the far more difficult Hindu or Chinese. Those who are sent, moreover, should be personally known by the Committee. Not only their linguistic powers, but also their personal peculiarities, need to be learned by seeing them face to face in repeated interviews. Mistakes with regard both to the appointment of missionaries and the conduct of the foreign work might be avoided, if the Committee could study their men more carefully before they go out, and could consult them more frequently after they return. One of our oldest and most faithful missionaries declared that he had been in America and near Boston about a year, and had not had an interview with the Committee, and others who have been more than a year at home have had to solicit the only interview they have had.

The Committee should insist that the new men whom they appoint should serve an apprenticeship for one or two years under some experienced missionary, before being put in full charge of independent work. Dr. Jewett regards this working under the direction of an older laborer as an important qualification for usefulness any where upon the foreign field. Even though the novice is to devote himself to teaching, he needs to know what to teach, and how to make his teaching a help to properly evangelical work. This he can best learn by practical experience in field-work, under the guidance of one who knows the people, their colloquial language, and their common ways.

Missionaries should be brought home, for the sake of health and contact with those who support them. And this change of scene should be more frequent, more regular, and also more brief, than it commonly is. Paul's missionary journeys were very successful, but none of them lasted more than four years. After each of them he came back to Palestine, and to the associations of his early days. The British in India have learned a valuable lesson, and now, in both the civil and military service, at the end of eight years of work, there comes a year of furlough. The first five years, of a missionary's life are more trying than any others. If, after five years, every new missionary could be brought home, and then, after a year of vacation, work in terms of eight years at a time, with a regularly recurring ninth year of rest, he would generally be not so entirely broken as to be unfit for a year of home service among the churches, his impressions would be more fresh and more easily given out to others, his health would be more easily recovered, and both for himself, the treasury, and the cause, it would be a matter of economy in the end. A narrow economy is a poor sort of economics, and a tender regard for the health of those who risk their lives in missionary service is the plain duty of the Board of Managers of our Missionary Union.

It should be plainly understood that the Board of Managers, through their Executive Committee, have control of the missionaries whom they support, and that, in cases where their rules are disobeyed, or where differences arise among the workers on the field, a corrective discipline, should be exercised. The churches will support them in maintaining discipline, and in standing by their just rules, whoever among their servants in the field may suffer. One case of prompt action would obviate the necessity of many others, while one case of neglect and submission renders the Committee powerless in all similar cases that may arise in future.

There will ever be divergent opinions with regard to particular measures. Missionaries will disagree. In such cases, the Board must decide. It can decide intelligently only as it knows the facts. It is important that the Secretary should personally know the missions of which he is the chief superintendent, and the suggestion of a journey on his part, once in ten years, in order that he may inspect the mission with his own eyes, and may hear the missionaries with his own ears, seems very wise and promising. We load the Secretary and the Committee with heavy responsibilities. Do we give them sufficient facilities for performing their work? Years ago, a sad controversy with regard to preaching and schools threatened the prosperity, if not the very existence, of our principal missions. A deputation sent to the other side of the world was a means, if not of harmonizing the conflicting opinions, yet at least of determining who among the missionaries could carry out the instructions of the Board, and of enabling the great majority to work together,—and it proved a most salutary expedient. Another great missionary body, threatened with a similar evil in Turkey, has recently appointed a deputation of the same sort. My contention is, that what has hitherto been done sporadically and infrequently, should be done regularly and as part of our routine work. Our Methodist brethren allow no five years to pass without sending a Bishop around the world, and the advantage that accrues, in the way of unity of plan and intelligent direction, from that personal visitation of the scattered missionary fields, is felt to be richly worth all the cost.

It has frequently been asked, by what methods the contributions of the home churches may be made more prompt and abundant, and how the interest of these churches in missions may be increased. The last of the business principles, which I shall mention, respects the relations of the Executive Committee to the churches and individuals who furnish the financial revenue of the Union. I must give my partial and qualified adhesion to the principle of bringing special churches at home into connection with special fields abroad. It is of course to Christ that we give; it is the whole world that we seek to save. But this does not forbid — it rather requires — that each Christian have particular persons at home whom he is striving to bring to Christ; nor does it forbid that he should have some particular people, province, mission-station, in which he is specially interested abroad. We want definiteness in our prayers and our efforts. Twice as much money can be raised for a specified missionary laborer whose needs are known, as can be raised for the work in general. Our brethren of other denominations, though slow in adopting this principle, are beginning to see that it is the true principle of missionary support. The churches of Oberlin, Ohio, with the students of the College, Theological Seminary, and Ladies' Institute, have formed a "China Band," the object of which is to lay hold of several central points in the great province of Shansi, and eventually to build an Oberlin in China. Shansi is an inland province of the Empire, hitherto almost untouched by missionary effort. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions have given this province to the Oberlin Band. They have already four missionaries in the field, clearing the way, and three others are preparing to go. Oberlin has taken the responsibility, Oberlin furnishes the men, Oberlin is to support the work.

I am persuaded that we have here a principle of missionary economics which is yet destined to work a revolution among us. Not that our Union is in any way to cease its work of inauguration and superintendence, — it is needed to unify and control. All its present agencies are none too many to employ in the work of collecting funds. It should still be held responsible for the general work of instituting and caring for our missions. All missionary moneys should pass through its treasury. All local societies should be simply auxiliary to it. Multitudes of individuals and of churches cannot take the responsibility of providing the entire support of a missionary. Let these combine their contributions as they do now, and let the Union administer the funds thus given. But wherever this is possible, let single states, single cities, single churches, single Sabbath schools, single mission-bands, single wealthy men at home, be encouraged to take up, and be responsible for the support of, certain missions, the evangelizing of certain provinces, the maintenance of certain schools, the salaries of certain missionaries, the living of certain native teachers, with the express qualification and stipulation, however, that their gifts shall all go through the treasury of the Union, and that the laborers whom they support shall all be controlled by the Union. In other words, let the privilege be offered, to all who will accept it, of doing some specific mission work in connection with our great Society, — the Society being the almoner and dispenser of their bounty, while it gives up none of its powers. Let individuals be encouraged to support specific missions, as Arthington of Leeds gave his fifty thousand to evangelize the newly discovered regions of Africa. We have wealthy men who could send the gospel into the heart of heathen empires. Let us give them the opportunity, — it will be better than offering them a kingdom. Who can doubt that missionary zeal would thus be quickened — that missionary contributions would be doubled — that missionary laborers would be multiplied, and that new prayer to God and new triumph of his cause would attend the new movement of the churches ? It is the principle of individual responsibility. I have urged it as a principle of business and financial management. But it is more than this — it is Baptist — it is Christian. Under God, it is the principle whose acceptance and observance will bring the world to Christ.

XXXVIII.

THE THEOLOGY OF MISSIONS.*

On behalf of the Christian people of Rochester, and of the Faculty and students of the Rochester Theological Seminary, I most cordially and affectionately welcome this Alliance to our houses of worship, our Seminary buildings, and our homes. It gladdens our eyes and warms our hearts, my young brethren, to see this great company of young men whom Christ has called to preach his glorious gospel. Though you are from many parts of our continent, and from Seminaries of many Christian names, Christ's banner floats over us all and we are one in him. In the name of Christ you come, and in the name of Christ we receive you.

For several weeks, in our daily meetings at the Seminary, we have prayed that we might be able to communicate as well as receive good while you were with us. It may help you to get good, if I tell you something about the Seminary and the city that welcome you. This Seminary is not one of the oldest represented here, but it was founded a generation since by good men and true, many of whom have now entered into rest. The stones of its walls were laid in prayers and tears and sacrifices. God's blessing has rested upon it. There has never failed in it a truly apostolic succession of faithful students who have been willing to consecrate themselves to the work of missions. Many have left us to go to the other side of the world as laborers in Burmah and China, and the bones of some of them are buried now under the shadow of heathen temples and pagodas. Others are sowing seed for great future harvests in the rich new fields of Dakota and Colorado and California and Oregon.

This city to which you come has been a city of revivals. Nature and art have done something for it, but grace has done more. In 1830, the prevailing influence here was one of skepticism. A powerful religious awakening under the preaching of Charles G. Finney, that lion-like reformer, brought the leading young merchants and physicians and lawyers into the churches, and the whole character of Rochester was changed. These young men grew up to be the leaders in every moral reform and in every religious movement of the generation that followed.— It was a remarkable instance, as I think, of the wide and almost incalculable results of good that may follow a single work of God's grace, and the labors of a single preacher, during the formative period of a city's history. And here, since then, there have been times when the Spirit of God has seemed to sweep down upon the whole community and to shake the very foundations of the place, as he did in the days of the

* An Address of Welcome, at the meeting of the Inter-Seminary Missionary Alliance, Rochester, October, 1885.

apostles. May God grant that such days may come again, and that your meeting with us may be the beginning of them.

We give you fair notice that we expect to get more from you than we give, although we give you all we can. I do not believe that the twelve apostles could have met together after Pentecost, to consult about their work, without leaving a blessing behind them. And I know that, as you come in the Spirit of Christ to ask what he will have you do, your debates and your decisions, your conversation and your example, will be a stimulus and inspiration, not only to all our students, but to all our friends. For I do not doubt that Christ himself has come with you, and that many a man, whose zeal and devotion were waning, will here be renewed in the spirit of his mind, and will go back to his work with the heroic determination to take his life in his hand and go far hence to the heathen.

We only need to look face to face at the facts of Christianity and of missions, to be stirred in our inmost being. Paradoxical as it may seem, missions are the greatest argument for Christianity, and Christianity is the greatest argument for missions. Missions are the distinctive mark of Christianity, as they are not of any other religion. Buddhism, it is true, is to a certain extent a missionary religion, and that because of the one grain of truth that mingles with its mass of error — the truth that knowledge and morality are not for a select caste, but for all. But the morality of Buddhism revolves around self, not around God. It has no organizing principle, — for it recognizes no God, no inspiration, no soul, no salvation, no personal immortality. Salvation is not from sin, but from desire, — and from this men can escape only by fleeing from life itself. Mohammedanism is in some sense a missionary religion, and that because of its one grain of truth — the oneness and spirituality of God. But Mohammedanism does not base morality on love. It conquers only by force. It does not convert either mind or heart. Both Buddhism and Mohammedanism appeal to immoral principles of human nature, — the one to the disposition to fly from evil instead of overcoming it; the other to the disposition to seek sensuous happiness as the chief end of life.

But Christian missions present to us the spectacle of men who do not flee from evil, but set out to conquer it, and to conquer it in the strength of God; of men who do this, not by violence, but in the power of love; not for the sake of sensuous happiness, but solely for the sake of Christ and the souls he died to save. The lives of Reginald Heber and Adoniram Judson and David Livingstone are the most devoted, the most pathetic, the most inspiring, the most sublime, that history can show. Take away the record of missionary lives and our conception of humanity is at once narrowed and lowered. But all the lives of modern missionaries are only copies in miniature — aye, even the life of Paul himself is only a copy in miniature — of the life of Jesus Christ, the great preacher and the great missionary.

As missions are the greatest argument for Christianity, missions show us what Christianity really is. If we can find out what it is that missionaries have preached, what has been the inspiration of their lives, what they have found the means of reclaiming and recreating the degraded and the lost, we may be pretty sure that that is Christianity, and that this Christianity is from God. Now I am certain that missions, as a matter of fact, have been

based upon an unwavering confidence in four fundamental doctrines, namely, first, the universal depravity and guilt of men; secondly, the substitutionary sacrifice of the Son of God to save them; thirdly, that this life only is the time to accept God's plan of mercy; fourthly, that the heathen are lost unless we carry to them the gospel. These faiths are still the sinews of missionary effort. Take one of them away and the impulse to missions ceases. If missions are from God, then these doctrines are from God,—for without them missions are impossible. And so, missions become an argument for Christianity,—not only for Christianity in general, but for its particular doctrines of sin, and atonement, of probation limited to this life, and of condemnation for all who are out of Christ.

But if missions are an argument for Christianity, Christianity is no less an argument for missions. If the gospel be true, then the only true object of life is to further Christ's plan of saving the world. If Christ has saved us, then the only fit return we can make is to give ourselves to him to be used in his service. But more than all else, the love of Christ constraineth us. That great love of his awakens responsive love in our hearts, and that love, once aroused, goes out toward that whole humanity which he took into union with himself, and which he died to save. Apart from Christ, there is no disposition toward missions,—to the mere philosopher the heathen do not seem worth the saving. But love for Christ is inseparable from love for men. And here for each of us comes the test of character. I remember well when I stood where you now stand. I had entered upon a course of theological study. I had in view the ministry of the gospel. But I was fresh from the competitions and emulations of college life. The ministry was to me an opportunity of doing good, but it was also a profession. Standing, honor, comfort, the gratification of intellectual tastes, the love for public address, were unconsciously strong motives and influences within me. One day I asked myself: "Do you love Christ enough to go to the Hottentots for him? And if you do not, what business have you to preach here, or anywhere else?" Then began a struggle, as painful and intense as any that I knew at my conversion. I found no rest for my soul until I was able to say: "Yes, I will go anywhere for Christ. I will count it an honor and a joy to tell the Hottentots the story of him who died for them." God did not so honor me. Health failed, and my work opened to me here at home. But that consecration was one of the epochs of my life. The mission-call was the test of my Christian character. If I had not responded rightly, I do not see what right I should have had to enter the ministry, or to call myself by the name of Christ at all.

The mission-call is the test of Christian character, both for the ministry and for the church. I most devoutly pray that here in these meetings that mission-call may be heard by every one of you. When the prophet Isaiah had revealed to him the burning glory of God's throne and the seraphim that evermore cry "Holy! holy! holy!" before it, he felt the contrast between that holiness and his own sin, and falling prostrate in the dust he uttered the leper's cry, "Unclean! unclean!" But then a live coal from the altar of sacrifice touched his lips, his iniquity was taken away and his sin purged; and when the voice of God came to him, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" the prophet answered: "Here am I, send me!" May God so

reveal here the glory of his justice and his grace, that each one of you shall hear God's call, and shall answer: "I will go — here am I — send me — wherever I can do the most to honor Christ and to save mankind."

God puts his ministers and his churches through long processes of preparation,— but results come often in an instant of time. He works through evolution in the ages of geology and in the ages of history. Providence moves through time, says Guizot, as the gods of Homer moved through space,— it takes one step and ages have past away. With the Lord a thousand years are as one day. But let us not forget the complementary truth. God is transcendent as well as immanent. He is not shut up to evolution. He can cut short his work of righteousness in sudden judgment; he can cut short his work of grace in sudden visitations of his power and glory. Nature is the living garment of the Deity, but God can thrust aside that garment and make bare his arm. He can condense the substance of a life-time into one hour's decision, and initiate an age-long movement of his kingdom in a single day. It is just as true that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, as it is that a thousand years are with him as one day.

Oh that this body of young men, with their vigor and enthusiasm, might have the faith that will make this gathering a time of the right hand of the Most High, a time of the revelation of God's will, a time of new enduing with power from on high, a time of entrance upon new enterprises for the glory of his name, a time of everlasting decisions, a time when years are crowded into hours! It took many years to tunnel and drill that rock at Hellgate that raised its head in the face of commerce and obstructed the free flowing of the tide. But at the last it was the touch of a little child that set at liberty all that imprisoned power and blew nine acres of rock into the air. My young friends, there is gunpowder in you which can accomplish a great deal, if it is only touched with the divine fire,— dynamite in you that can blow up the rocky foundations of Satan's throne, if it only came into contact with the electric energy of the living God. It is the touch of a childlike faith that brings the two — man's will and God's will — together. If you have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, you shall say to this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea,— and it shall obey you. Yes, every mountainous obstacle, within us or without, that obstructs the progress of God's kingdom, may be removed, aye, may be removed more quickly than we know, if we only have faith. May God give you all this faith, that this meeting may witness a blowing to fragments, a sweeping away forever, of some mighty obstacle to the progress of God's kingdom, either in your own souls or in the world outside of you. So may the Hellgate of ambition and unbelief within, or of human and Satanic opposition without, be changed by God's power into a very Heaven-gate through which the flood-tide of God's salvation may flow to us and to the world.

XXXIX.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE CHERUBIM.*

Even in the first pages of the book of Genesis, we find that beautiful combination of justice and mercy which makes the Bible a perfect revelation. There is threatening here, but there is promise also,—not far from every curse you will find the announcement of a blessing. By the dim light of these early records, we can see that the picture of God's character drawn for the childhood of the race was symmetrical and true,—the main features were there, and all later revelations have only more perfectly displayed and unfolded them.

He is very far from the truth who supposes that the religion of mankind had its origin only in human fears,—even the preparatory dispensations were full of comfort and promise. Man's sin had opened a Pandora's box of ills, and had sent them forth to desolate the world, but hope was still suffered to remain. On the one hand, the curse was alleviated by being made the occasion of incidental blessing. The necessity of labor, which seemed so hard at first, was made the means of developing human resources and ensuring human progress, while it restrained in no small degree the growth of human sin. The supreme sorrow of woman was made her honor,—she who had brought sin into the world and all our woe, was permitted to bring into the world its Savior and to transmit to all generations the blessings of his salvation. Even the gloom of death was lighted up when it became to the righteous the gateway of escape from the toils and sorrows of life, and of entrance upon a happier and holier state of being.

But besides these incidental blessings which were made by divine mercy to alleviate the terrors of the sentence against sin, a still greater blessing was bestowed in the assurance that sin itself should be finally done away. This assurance was given in direct promise. The serpent should be crushed, bruised, trampled in the dust by the woman's seed,—all subjection to him should cease,—complete victory over all his arts and powers should be achieved. It was given, too, in symbol. The skins of animals offered in sacrifice, with which it is more than probable that our first parents were clothed by God, afforded a beautiful type of that divine righteousness, secured only by the death of another, with which God would clothe their guilty souls. And yet another symbolic lesson of hope and comfort was given in the Cherubim, which were stationed at the entrance of Eden, after man was banished from the garden.

With regard to the meaning of these mysterious forms, there has been

* A sermon upon the text, Genesis 3 : 24—"So he drove out the man, and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

the greatest diversity of opinion. Yet, amid the multitude of explanations, I am satisfied that there is one which not only harmonizes the Scriptural accounts, but furnishes important practical instruction. In considering this difficult subject — the nature and purpose of the cherubim — let us first free ourselves from certain common misconceptions of the narrative in Genesis. You remember that man, having disobeyed his Creator, and having set himself in opposition to the will of God, came to know good only by the loss of it, and to know evil by sad and bitter experience. Since he had forsaken God, the source of life, he was driven forth from "the tree of life," and "the land of life." "And God placed at the east of the garden of Eden cherubim, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life."

The common impression with regard to this passage is that the cherubim are executors of the divine vengeance, and that they stand at the gates of Eden brandishing the sword of flame, and barring all return. This is nearly the view which Milton takes in the closing lines of Paradise Lost; there the sinning pair,

> "Hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow,
> Through Eden take their solitary way,"

> "And looking back, all the eastern side behold
> Of Paradise, so late their happy seat,
> Waved over by that flaming brand; the gate
> With dreadful faces thronged, and fiery arms."

But a slight examination of the text suffices to show that the sword and the cherubim are not necessarily connected, as both of them and equally manifestations of divine wrath,— they are rather placed side by side as distinct and separate symbols,—while the word which describes their office is a word capable of double meaning, and admits the supposition that the purpose of the cherubim, and the purpose of the sword, were radically different.

There is nothing in this text of Genesis to forbid our believing that in these symbolic forms of sword and cherubim, stationed at the entrance of Eden, we have an example of that constant juxtaposition of the emblems of justice and mercy which meets us throughout the Bible. The establishment of this view will occupy us further on. It is sufficient here to say, that I find in the flaming sword the emblem of God's avenging justice,— and in this its whole meaning is exhausted. The cherubim, on the other hand, were meant, as I believe, not to terrify, but to inspire with hope. The sword meant judgment only,— the cherub-forms meant mercy. Even in driving forth his creatures from Paradise, God did not manifest himself in unmitigated wrath, nor send them forth into a rayless gloom of toil and suffering and death. As our first parents turned sorrowfully to take one last passionate look at the home of their innocence, never more to be theirs on earth, they saw the flaming sword indeed,— that told them of injured holiness forbidding all approach,— but side by side with that flame-like sword, were the glorious figures of the cherubim, teaching them that the Paradise they had lost should be reserved for them, until they should return to it again, fitted for more exalted enjoyments and possessed of a more perfect nature than they had before the fall. The cherubim were not vague images of terror, but symbols of mercy and restoration, inspiring the exiled

pair with hope and courage. The sword was the image of justice, keeping the way of the tree of life *from* unholy man. The cherubim were the image of mercy, keeping the way of the tree of life *for* man, when once he should be redeemed and perfected by God's discipline of grace,— and holding out to him, amidst his woe, the promise of a Paradise Regained.

This passage in Genesis, taken by itself, throws but little light upon the form of the cherubim. There is no description of them,— it is taken for granted, indeed, that the figures are already known. The etymology of the word "cherub" is involved in hopeless obscurity. We are left to the intimations of other parts of Scripture, therefore, for almost all our knowledge respecting them. There are, fortunately, three other places in the sacred record where these symbolic forms appear. In the 25th chapter of Exodus, Moses is directed to make two golden cherubim, one at each end of the mercy-seat in the holy of holies. The two are to look toward each other and toward the mercy-seat, where the divine glory was manifested and the Almighty made his throne. But even in the narrative of the book of Exodus, so full of detailed description of the tabernacle and all its furniture, there is almost complete silence respecting the object or appearance of these figures of gold. Nothing is told us of their structure, except that they had wings stretched forth on high which covered the mercy-seat, and faces bent downwards, it may be, in the attitude of adoration.

Pass on, then, from book to book of the Old Testament, and you find no other description, until you reach Ezekiel's visions of what he calls "the living creatures," in the first and tenth chapters of his prophecy. He beholds four glorious forms, each having four faces and four wings. Only one of these faces is the face of man,— the three others are the faces respectively of an ox, a lion, and an eagle. Each one of these living creatures has the hands of a man. Immense revolving wheels are underneath each one, carrying them, with the speed of a meteor-flash, wherever they will go. These four bear aloft a sapphire pavement upon which rests a throne,— and upon the throne sits God himself. This description of the living creatures of Ezekiel's vision is connected with the earlier part of our investigation by a single sentence of the prophet, which reads: "And I knew that they were the cherubim,"— those sacred figures, namely, with which he had been familiar when performing his duties as priest in the temple. The living creatures and the cherubim, therefore, are one and the same.

From this point we must take a long leap before we find another reference to them, and when we find it, it is the last of all, and in the last book of the Bible. In the Revelation of John, we read of the "four beasts," that worship and adore in the innermost circle of heaven. Consult the original, and you find that this word "beasts" is an utter mistranslation. The word is the same as that translated "living creatures" in Ezekiel. Not only is the same name applied to them, but there is a remarkable similarity of description. The same composite forms appear in the Revelation that meet us in Ezekiel's prophecy, but each has not four faces as there. Yet each has a face after one of the four types,— there is one face of an ox, one of an eagle, one of a lion, and one of a man. Here too, the number of wings is not four but six. In Ezekiel's vision, the wheels are full of eyes,— here there are no wheels, but the living creatures themselves, around and within, are full of eyes.

There can be little question, then, that the cherubim of the tabernacle and temple, the living creatures of Ezekiel, and the hymning "beasts" of the Revelation, are one and the same symbol.

From these Biblical descriptions certain deductions may be drawn, which may gradually open to us the design and nature of the cherubim. First, then, the cherubim are artificial, temporary, symbolic figures,— not actual, personal, eternal existences. They are not personal beings, of a higher order than man, ranging with archangels and the principalities of heaven,— but they are rather types and representations of spiritual existence. This we may infer from the fact that they assume different shapes and appearances, according to the ends to be attained by their appearances, each having variously four faces or one face, six wings or four wings, a multitude of eyes, or none at all. They appear, too, only at times when God is speaking in the language of symbol, as in the visions of John and Ezekiel, over the mercy-seat, or at the gates of Eden. They never speak to men nor hold communication with men. Their whole aim seems accomplished, when they have once set forth the idea of an existence near to God, and subservient to his will.

Secondly, while they are not themselves personal existences, they are symbols of personal existence — symbols not of divine nor angelic perfections, but of human nature. Two main facts make it clear that they are emblems of human nature. On the one hand the predominating appearance of them, as Ezekiel tells us, is that of a man. Their upright posture and gestures indicate that the body is human. There are the hands of a man under their wings. In Revelation, though only one of them had the face of a man, all four had a human body. In truth, all the descriptions agree with the prophet's words: "And this was their appearance — they had the likeness of a man." Another fact, and one which furnishes the key to the whole mystery, is given us by John. We read that the four living creatures with the four and twenty elders, fall down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps and golden bowls full of odors,— and thus prostrate before the throne, they sing this new song: "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." This is the song of the redeemed. Can it be the song of angels or archangels? Has Christ been slain for the redemption of angels? Let the author of the epistle to the Hebrews answer: "Verily, he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Moreover we have only to look a few verses further in the Revelation, and we find that the song of the angels is a totally distinct and separate one — a song in which there is no note of praise like this: "Thou hast redeemed *us* to God by thy blood, and hast made us kings and priests unto God, and we shall reign on the earth." This is the new song of redeemed humanity, which "none can learn except those who have been redeemed from the earth."

In this reference to the book of Revelation, I have followed the Authorized Version, in spite of the fact that the Revised Version omits the word "us," and substitutes in italics the word "men"— a change which might intimate that the cherubim do not identify themselves with redeemed

humanity. The reading of the Authorized Version has better textual support, and has the advantage of assigning an object to the verb "redeemed," while the text followed by the Revised Version gives the verb no expressed object, but is obliged, in a somewhat unnatural way, to supply one. I regard the view I have propounded as the most probable one, apart from the testimony of this particular passage, — with this passage, it appears to me to have the force of demonstration. Over against the view we adopt, however, — the view that the cherubim are symbols of redeemed humanity — there stands another view which I must mention, this, namely, that the cherubim are symbols of nature, as pervaded by the divine energy and as subordinated to the divine purpose. Those who hold this view would say that in the cherubim the world of nature, including both the material and the brute creation, is represented as praising God. I am persuaded that this view may be combined with the one I have been advocating, and only by so enlarging it can it be made consistent or intelligible. For how can nature ever find a voice, except in redeemed humanity? Man, as having a physical organism, is a part of nature; as having a soul, he emerges from nature, and can speak, as nature of herself never could. Only through man, is nature, otherwise blind and dumb and dead, able to appreciate and express the Creator's glory. The cherubim then are symbols of redeemed man, in his two-fold capacity of image of God and as priest of nature. Not in soul only, but in body also, does he speak forth God's praise, and only as redeemed humanity thus praises God does the material universe give glory to him who made it.

But, thirdly, the cherubim are emblems of human nature, not in its present stage of development, but possessed of all its original perfections. For this reason the most perfect animal forms are combined with that of man. The Jewish proverb ran: "There are four highest in the world — the lion among the beasts, the ox among cattle, the eagle among birds, man among all creatures, — but God is supreme over all." These cherubic forms combine the excellencies of these four chiefs of God's terrestrial creation. Before the fall, it may be, man possessed these excellencies in a far higher degree, and so was lord of the animal creation, himself being the climax of creaturely perfection. But his sin deprived him of this high place. The animal world emancipated itself from his dominion, and now the ox, the lion, the eagle, all have powers which man has not in the same perfection. We see then that though the essential nature of man is highest of all, yet it might be greatly elevated and ennobled by superadding to it the qualities typified in these animal forms. To symbolize perfected human nature every creature perfection on earth must be comprehended and combined with his own. To superadd to his own perfections those of the animal kingdom is not to degrade but to exalt him — to picture him indeed in that original supremacy in which "all things are put under his feet, all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas."

Add then to human nature all the lionlike qualities — kinglike majesty and peerless strength, undaunted courage and glowing zeal, innate magnanimity and nobleness of spirit, royal superiority to the petty and the mean, secure and triumphant carelessness of every foe. Take your weak and timid

Christian and endow him with these qualities, and lo! a Knox or a Luther. The lion is the king among beasts. Engraved on the throne of Solomon, it has been the emblem of royalty ever since. What does it mean here among these cherubic forms, but an intimation of the kingly dignity and courage and strength that belong to the unfallen sons of God.—What now are the qualities of the ox? We at once count among them, patient labor, productive energy, meek submission to the yoke, unwearied and useful service. Hence the ox was placed higher than the horse, and in Egypt the home and mother-land of symbols, was even made an object of worship. Take now your vacillating, inconstant, labor-hating, self-willed, useless Christian,—add to him the ox-like qualities,—lo! you have a Howard or a Harlan Page. And what is the meaning of this symbol here, if not that our human nature, as one of its proper perfections, must possess the spirit of humble yet restless service which they display who rest not night or day in their heavenly service of ministration and of worship?—Then, too, the eagle, marvelous for vision and for flight,—able, according to the ancient notions, to see fish in the sea from the greatest heights, and to gaze undazzled on the sun. The epithet eagle-eyed is too graphic to need an explanation, even to the commonest mind. In the Revelation, the fourth face was that of a "flying eagle," bringing to our thoughts the ancient declaration that no bird can fly so far or so high. How vivid an image of an active, vigilant, fervent, soaring spirit, prompting the readiest and swiftest execution of the divine behests, and lifting the soul up from the low concerns of sense to the insight and contemplation of divine and spiritual glories. Take now your earthly-minded, short-sighted, narrow-hearted Christian, and add to him these qualities of spiritual flight and vision,—and lo! a St. John or a Fénélon stands before you. What does the eagle symbolize, but the fact that to human nature, in its truest, noblest development, belong an insight into divine realities and a soaring of the spirit into the regions of divine communion, of which we get here only the rare and rapturous foretastes. Take man—even redeemed man in his present state—and give him the qualities typified by all these animal forms,—then add reason, conscience, will, affection, raised each to their highest powers attainable,—and how magnificent is the sum!

But, fourthly, these cherubic forms represent not merely material or earthly perfections, but are emblems of human nature spiritualized and sanctified. It is important to observe that the term "living creatures" is used more than thirty times in Ezekiel and Revelation to describe them. We cannot fail to see that life in its highest state of power and activity is indicated as their essential characteristic. And the descriptions of the prophetic visions bear out this inference. They are creatures instinct with life. The wheels in Ezekiel, and their whole bodies in Revelation, are full of eyes—the symbol of intelligent life. "The spirit of the living creature," we read, "was in the wheels,"—they communicated life to things else inanimate. We see in them a quick and restless activity,—they run and return with lightning speed,—their wings, ever outstretched, indicate incessant motion. They represent that humanity in which Christ's purpose is accomplished, that it might have life and have it more abundantly. Yet this life is not physical alone or chiefly—but spiritual. It is holy life as opposed

to sin, the death of the soul. They made no crooked paths for their feet, but every one, as the prophet tells us, went straight forward. And they had no need to turn, in order to move in the path of rectitude, for there were wheels beneath each one which crossed one another transversely, so that, in whichever direction the cherub would move, in that direction the swiftly revolving wheels were ready to carry him. They move too on God's errands, obeying instantly the voice from above the throned firmament of sapphire blue. If they represent human nature, it must be a human nature perfectly subject to the divine will, and executing the divine commands. We cannot bring before our imagination the scene in the Apocalypse and the unceasing worship of the divine perfections, nor the scene in the prophet's vision, where the reflection from them of the divine glory is intolerable to mortal eyes, without seeing in them the symbols of a human nature not only restored to its original purity, but possessed at length of a holiness and beauty far surpassing that which was lost by the fall.

Fifthly, these figures set forth, in type and shadow, a human nature exalted to be the dwelling place of God. For the cherubim dwell in the immediate presence of God. Not only was the tabernacle God's habitation and their habitation, and so the whole of the curtains forming the interior of the tent were interwoven with cherubic figures, but they dwelt close to the very throne of God, on the mercy-seat. There, between the cherubim, was the seat of the commonwealth of Israel. There God manifested his glory. There was the place of the "Shekinah." And there, in the very blaze of the divine glory, and with faces turned towards it as witnesses of the divine glory, were the cherubim. Aye, they not only dwell with God and are eye witnesses of his majesty, but God dwells in them. The living creatures in Ezekiel are pervaded, not with a self-fed and self-originated life, but it is God's life that flows through them and manifests itself in them. And the cherubim of the Revelation are not of any outer circle of worshipers, but appear in the midst of the throne. What is this, but the glorious prophecy of a human nature perfectly restored and transcendently exalted,— made one again with God and made the dwelling place of God,— rescued forever from the curse and stain of sin, filled once more with the divine life, seated on the throne with Christ, clothed with a glory and beauty that reflect the glory and beauty of God, and so, endowed with privileges and elevated to dignities infinitely greater than those over whose loss the race of man has shed so many and so bitter tears!

Apply these conclusions now to the passage before us. What was the special meaning of the cherubim at the gates of Eden, when man was driven out for his sin? I answer, they taught our first parents, and they teach us, that Paradise, though lost, is still reserved for man. The cherubim were stationed there to occupy, until man should be ready to return. Just that imagery was employed which would waken in him a just and true view of God. Terror and repulsion were not the emotions which God desired in this child just banished from his Father's house. The sword was needed there, to vindicate God's holiness and show the guilt of sin, but an image of mercy and hope was needed also. When Adam looked back towards the entrance of his lost Eden, the sword indeed awed him, but these living forms, made in his own mould, yet endowed with exalted beauties and capa-

bilities, these indicated to him that Paradise was not blotted out of existence, nor given to beings of another order and sphere, but was still reserved for him in God's mercy. Earthly forms like his own still held it. The region of life was not lost to man forever. Human nature was yet destined to regain the lost Paradise.

Again, these figures taught Adam, and the early races of mankind, that Paradise could only be regained by man's return to holiness and divine communion. Hence the forms were not common forms of humanity, but ideal forms, exalted representations of human nature, fit to dwell in closest intimacy with God, pervaded by his life and reflecting his glory. The great lesson was taught, that holiness must come before blessedness, and that man shall regain his lost estate when he has nothing to fear from the divine justice. The promise of restoration shall be fulfilled, not by the surrender of the divine righteousness, but by providing for its exercise while the creature is notwithstanding saved. In other words, salvation is from God, yet salvation shall not obscure, but glorify and honor, the divine justice.

With this symbolic promise, too, of a rightly restored and sanctified human nature, was combined the promise that the Paradise Regained should be more glorious than the Paradise Lost. Not only should there be life instead of death, fellowship instead of estrangement, love instead of hostility, purity in place of pollution, but all these blessings should be large and abundant beyond all human experience or comprehension. The recovery should not be partial, but complete and more than complete,— nay, the powers of sin should be so vanquished, and the plans of the adversary so outwitted, that God's grace should get greater glory and the human race greater blessedness, than could have been without the fall. So not man's efforts or deserts, but God's almighty and conquering grace, shall be magnified in the admission of the creature to a closer relation to God, and a participation in grander sights and ministrations than were ever known under the original constitution of things. How much of all this symbolism was understood by our first parents, we cannot know; but this we may believe, that in the light of the promise, and under the scrutiny of keener intuitions than ours, both they and the earliest members of a believing seed found in it a hope and comfort which mere words could never have given. Aye, I love to fancy, that under the inward teachings of God's spirit, the first Adam amid his sorrow and weariness had some glimpses, at least, of the land of rest which only the second Adam fully revealed to the world, and that in spirit, if not in words, he sang:

> "There happier bowers than Eden's bloom,
> Nor sin nor sorrow know;
> Blest seats,— through rude and stormy seas,
> I onward press to you!"

Yet doubtless much was left to be unfolded in the progress of God's revelation. As man comes nearer and nearer to occupying the high position typified by the cherubim, his knowledge of divine mysteries grows also. And this growing nearness to the divine, and consequent nearness to the Paradisaic state, seems to be symbolized in the varying relations of man to these cherubic forms. At the expulsion from Eden, the region of holy life was shut to men of flesh and blood, and none could approach the cherubim.

But in the tabernacle, the human and earthly won a greater nearness to the divine, and in the person of the high priest, men could approach to the very feet of the cherubim of glory. In Ezekiel, the favorite of God is admitted to a still grander and more open view of God's glory. In the early visions of the Apocalypse, man has reached the very place of the cherubim, — the type and the antitype meet and mingle, — the elders who are the select ones of the church, and the cherubim which only symbolize the church, are together in the midst of the throne. But now, when man once fallen has been led by the Lamb to the very height and pinnacle of created being, the cherubim, having served their purpose as foreshadowings of that exalted state, disappear and vanish away. In the last visions of Revelation, amid the most glowing descriptions of the heavenly glories and the heavenly inhabitants, these symbolic forms are seen no longer. Since man has at length reëntered the long lost Eden, and now eats of the tree of life which yields twelve manner of fruits and whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, the cherubim keep the way of the tree of life no longer, for Paradise is regained, and the promise is fulfilled.

These mysterious forms were indeed but symbols — symbols that were lower and less than the realities they symbolized. It would be childish to imagine, then, that they illustrate to us what our future bodies will be. We are not to have forms like those of the cherubim, but we are to have all the glorious qualities of heart and mind and soul which they typified, and these very figures may assure us that whatever may be lacking to us here will be supplied there. How grand an object of contemplation is the glory that yet waits to be revealed! That heavenly knowledge, power, holiness, — that fullness of spiritual life of which the kingly energy of the lion, the unwearied service of the ox, the soaring flight of the eagle, are but poor symbols, — that nearness to God and that sight of his glory which John and Ezekiel faintly pictured, are not these the only fit objects of ambition? Do they not dwarf our highest conceptions of human destiny? Yes, it was for this imperial greatness that man was made, and if we forget it, we forget it to our sorrow. Earthly glories fade, but the glory of a human soul that has grown up in all things into Christ fades never. Who of us shall be kings and priests unto God? Who of us shall shine as the brightness of the sun forever and ever? Who shall cry, like the burning ones before the throne: "Holy! holy! holy!" Ah, it shall not be the great, the rich, the proud, the wise, of the earth, unless they can sing before the Lamb, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." Those only shall reach the summit of heavenly glory and felicity, who have bowed here in humility and penitence at the foot of the Savior's cross. Who of us shall dwell forever with God, — and who of us shall dwell in everlasting burnings? Both dwelling-places are offered to us, — God offers one, — the devil offers the other. Choose ye this day!

XL.

WOMAN'S PLACE AND WORK.

This word of God, which comes echoing down to us from our long-lost Paradise, is the key-word to the whole enigma of woman's place and work. It was uttered before temptation and sin had disordered human relations, before selfishness and transgression had blinded man to the natural rights of woman, before the curse had turned associations of joy into a source of bitterness and trial. It tells us what God intended woman to be, what he originally fitted her to be, what it is her true nature to be, what she would have been if the race had not fallen, what she will be in just the degree to which the race is restored. And if our highest glory in this earthly life is to be what God intended us to be, and to accomplish the work which he sent us into the world to do, it is certainly wise for woman to compare her own nature with the divine descriptions of it, and strive to realize to the utmost the ideal of her character and work that exists in the mind of God.

What then was the Paradisaic state of woman? I answer: she was the "help meet of man," or as it is more accurately translated "a helper over against him,"—evidently signifying a helper suitable for him, corresponding to him, one like him in person, disposition, affection, united to him by the tenderest ties, always present before him to aid, sympathize, and comfort, and yet not the same but different, the counterpart, the complement, the converse of himself. And if you read onward a few verses, you find that, when God brings to man his new created companion and bestows her upon him in the bonds of the marriage covenant, Adam receives her, not as his slave, not as his fellow simply, but as a part of himself, giving her a name taken from his own name, and engaging to cleave unto her in a perpetual union of sympathy and affection. In these simple statements, we have the whole Scriptural doctrine of woman's proper and normal condition. And that doctrine may be summed up in three particulars: 1st, Equality with man in nature; 2ndly, Subordination to man in office; 3rdly, Union with man in life and work.

Let me make these three particulars somewhat plainer. First, Woman is the equal of man in nature. She has the same humanity,—the same divine hand formed her. She is not the creature of man, but the creature of God,—and God set her over against man as his counterpart, his complement, his second self. The words "over against man," while they imply that she is not the same with man, but different from him, just as plainly imply that her nature is in no respect inferior to his. The equality between them is an

*A sermon preached in the First Baptist Church, Rochester, July 21, 1878, on the text, Genesis 2 : 18—"And the Lord God said: It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him."

equality of value, but not an equality of identity. Secondly, She is subordinate to man in office. She is to be helper, not principal. Therefore man has precedence in the order of creation,— woman is made of man, and to supply the felt need of man. The race, therefore, is called the race of man, not the race of woman. Man, superior not at all in his essential nature, has yet a superiority in office. His it is to subdue the world and govern it,— and woman's office is the subordinate one of being man's helper, man's furnisher, man's inspirer. But thirdly, This subordination of woman to man in office, works no degradation to her, but constitutes her truest glory. For, in her office of helper, she is no servant. She stands, not beneath, but side by side. Aye, she is one with him in life and work — her equal influence penetrating and pervading his — her soul possessing and appropriating all his joys and all his conquests. The two are one. They each give up personal preferences for the common weal. The personal liberty of the man is restrained as much as that of the woman,—neither can go where they like. The man serves the woman, as really as the woman serves the man,— there is no slavery, for when was it heard of that a master worked for the support of his slave, and not the slave for the support of his master? Man gives her his name and they are one in law thenceforth, not because of any trampling under foot of her rights, or annihilation of her personality, but because she is actually one with her husband, having her interests common with his. Woman was once in man as part of his very body,— and that original unity is shadowed forth in the oneness of their life and work.

There is a passage in the New Testament which throws great light upon the true character of this relation, and illustrates very perfectly every one of the three particulars we have been considering. It is found in the eleventh chapter of First Corinthians, where the apostle is speaking of the modesty and subordination proper to the female sex. What limitations must be put upon the literal interpretation of his command to the women of his day, I shall indicate presently. This passage is not affected by them. "Here I would have you know," he says, "that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." Observe how an analogy is drawn between the relation of man to woman, and the relation of God to Christ. Between God and Christ there is perfect equality in point of *nature*,— but, in his *office* of incarnate Redeemer and Savior, Christ was subordinate to the Father. Did this subordination of the Son destroy their union or the community of interest between them? Hear the Savior say: "I and my Father are one." So it is the lot of woman, that being equal to man in point of nature, she comes, after the example of the Son of God, to hold an office of subordination. Not to be ministered unto, but to minister, she comes,— in all manner of helpful service proving herself to be one with him, and in this humbling of herself finding herself most truly exalted.

You have seen that I have taken God's words with regard to woman before the fall, as the standard of appeal in our discussion of her true position. I do not consider that the curse pronounced upon woman has anything to do with determining her rightful place and work. Even if that curse were an arbitrary decree of God, as some so unjustly interpret it, it would be no business of ours to execute it. If the slave-holder's ancient but baseless

notion that "Cursed be Canaan" referred to the negro race, what right did it give him to kidnap and enslave them? But none of God's curses are arbitrary decrees,—they are only prophecies of what will be, and must be, the natural results of sin. And when God uttered those words of doom to woman: "I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be unto thy husband, and he shall rule over thee," this so-called curse was but the pitiful forewarning of a long course of tyranny and oppression, in which alienation from God should bring forth its natural fruits, and the female sex should find their pleading love and their longings for sympathy and their aspirations for better things met too often by imperious contempt and sensual degradations. In how many a land and age these predictions of the consequences of transgression have been verified! How often women have been bought and sold like cattle; how often their very sex has been turned into a reproach and stigma; how often it has been even denied that they had souls! But this is not the sentence of Christianity or the Bible. These recognize often the existence of the customs of the day, and dissuade men from hasty attempts to break them up, lest the evil be greater than the good. So Paul exhorted the Romans to obey Nero instead of rising in insurrection, and commanded the Corinthian women not to violate the general sense of propriety in the community around them,—but these exhortations ceased to be binding when the circumstances which called them forth had changed. Both Christianity and the Bible bring in their train the enfranchisement of woman and the lifting of the curse. As the curse is only a prediction of the natural consequences of sin, wherever the gospel puts an end to men's supreme selfishness and love of power there woman escapes from her state of slavish subjection, and is recognized as the equal and companion of man. The Hindu woman never dares to sit at the same table with her lord, nor to walk by his side. Her husband and her sons must eat before her while she serves, and she must walk like a slave behind them. Even the Jewish Rabbins said, "No man ever salutes a woman," and "He that teaches his daughter in the law is as one who plays the fool." Let the women of our day thank God for the Bible, and for what it has wrought. Who can doubt that it is to accomplish much more, not only in heathen, but in Christian lands, until woman reaches the height for which God made her, and becomes in the noblest sense the equal and helper of man? The gospel of Christ is to abolish the curse at last, and we are to do our part in hastening its abolition.

With this view, it is our duty to recognize and put away all those relics of ancient injustice in our laws and manners which deprive woman of her just consideration and of the just rewards of her labor. In all power there is a natural tendency to abuse, and there can be little doubt that man's power over woman has been often very shamefully and injuriously exercised. It is often the case that the laws of a country are palpably unjust, simply because they reflect the manners and opinions of an age gone by. There are certain provisions in the laws of many of our states which unfairly deprive the wife or widow of the control of her property or her children. The public sentiment of the day, when once called to act upon these incongruities in our legislation, almost invariably rectifies them. There are other disabilities which women labor under with regard to education,—the highest

facilities of culture have not been offered to them as freely as to men. There are occupations closed to them now, which might well be opened to them. Steam-working machinery has taken much work out of their hands, and nothing has yet been put in its place. The result is that the labor of women is confined too much to a narrow range, with all the disadvantages of immense competition within it. Now, in all these things, our human as well as our Christian feeling carries us with the advocates of reform. We thank them for bringing these things to our notice,— we bid them God-speed in their work,— we assure them of our sympathy and aid in every effort to secure to woman the possession of her own property and earnings, the development of her powers by the highest education, the opening to her of every field of labor or trust which she is fitted to occupy, whether it be literature or art, brokerage or medicine, teaching or book-keeping, and the right to the same wages which men receive for the same work. There can be little doubt that many women have peculiar gifts for work that hitherto has been interdicted to them. There are some, unbound by family ties, who may do the world more good by their public teaching, than they could do by confining themselves to the common work of women. Exceptional as these cases are, and repugnant to our tastes as their course may sometimes be, we have no right to pass harsh judgment upon them, so long as they do not manifestly violate the rules of modesty and subordination laid down in the word of God. We may not yet know all that is in woman to do. Let us be willing to tolerate many a failure, and to look very kindly upon the experiments she makes, for only thus can many learn where their real strength lies and what is their true vocation. Let us be willing to accord to woman the fullest possible development of her powers, and the widest scope for their exercise, consistently with the nature and place that God has given her.

But while we acknowledge that the womanly nature is broader than has been supposed, and that it deserves the noblest opportunities for cultivation and use, are there no limits to its range? Has womankind the same place and work as man? May she rightly aspire, for example, to the same public and political life with man? Here we part company from the modern agitators of so-called woman's rights, and declare that nature, as well as the Bible, has proclaimed not only woman's equality of nature but her subordination in office. I say nature as well as the Bible has proclaimed this,— and how? By the simple fact of sex — a fact seldom alluded to in addresses upon the platform, and difficult to treat in the pulpit, but a fact completely decisive of the whole question. It is too commonly assumed that woman is but a sort of undeveloped and suppressed man. Sidney Smith once said that if boys and girls were educated alike, they would soon be indistinguishable from each other,— a sentiment which shows that wise and witty men can sometimes utter things not wise nor witty either. And John Stuart Mill, whose book on the Subjection of Women has been the great arsenal from which most of the late arguments for woman's suffrage have been drawn, treats the whole subject almost as if the distinction of sex did not exist, and had no influence of its own on character. Hence he ascribes the general condition of subordination, which has prevailed almost without exception from the beginning until now, simply to the law of the strongest, by which

the earliest men, seeing the value of women as bond-maids, made them by force their slaves. So man, being the stronger, has put woman under his heel, and has kept her there ever since. Now we might urge that such an explanation of a universal fact from mere superiority of brute force, without taking into account the affinities that undoubtedly exist between the sexes, is far more incredible and unphilosophical than the Biblical explanation, according to which God made the woman by nature a helper, and brought her, in accordance with that nature, to the man,— who on his part longed for a companion. It forgets the fact that this subordination, with all its perversions and abuses on the part of man, has yet been no involuntary servitude, but a willing subjection, and the source of many of the purest joys of life to scores of generations. And for this office of subordination, whether they assent to it or not, women are fitted by their very constitution. Woman, in the first place, is of less stature and strength. If measured with man according to his own standard, she must be deemed inferior, for unless in intelligence and power of will she far excel him, this inferiority in physical strength makes her the second, not the first. Then, secondly, there is the natural and inborn attraction of the sexes — an attraction whose essence consists partly in the love of weakness for courage and strength, and the delight of manhood in the protection and upholding of that which clings to it for shelter and rest. If you could snap the cords of written law all over the globe,— if you could say to every woman ; "Your hour of freedom has come — assert your right to absolute equality,"— you would find that, no long time after, society would return to its old ways ; the man with his strength, going out to earn bread for the family, would, on his return, be saluted gladly as its head ; and the wife would delight to serve him. It is the man who represents the principle of authority, and it is woman's nature to recognize and delight in it. The most high-spirited girl, however she may be educated to believe in exaggerated estimates of the rights of woman, no sooner falls in love and is married, than all her theories of absolute equality go to the winds, and in practice she finds herself, in her enthusiastic affection, putting herself of her own accord into subjection to her husband, "even as Sarah of old obeyed Abraham, calling him lord." And this will be so all the more, if the husband refrain from all acts of authority, and, instead of assuming the place of superiority, takes only what true affection gives him. As oil and water find their places, when mixed together, so it will be with every ingenuous wedded pair.

The conclusions of science, so far as they go, disprove the oft-repeated assertion that "the soul has no gender." These differences of sex are most essential and radical. They must, and in point of fact they do, wonderfully influence character, giving to man the place of force and authority — to the woman that of help and submission. But beyond all this, there are peculiar liabilities of woman, in her normal state, which necessarily prevent unremitting labor or public duties of any kind. As the greatest advocate of woman's equality with man himself confesses, "Out-door occupations would in any event be practically interdicted to the great majority of women." The great fault of his discussion, however, is, that woman's nature and woman's special work are studiously kept out of sight. The advocates of woman's rights are too often silent with regard to that great function of women which con-

stitutes their chief and most important care. A function with which the sex at large cannot dispense without being false to the end of their being and their mission in the world. There are times when, if they are true women, and live the normal and appointed life of women, they must give up outward labor,— must give up their preaching, if they are preachers ; the practice or study of the professions, if they are engaged in these ; the work of public offices, if they are employed there. Children must be born into the world, if the world is to go on,— and the best of women must be mothers, if the best of men are to fill our places of trust and power. There must be times of seclusion, even if they are allowed to enter upon public duties,— and then, whether they will or no, they must be dependent upon others. Man's life goes on in uninterrupted strength and activity. Theirs has its seasons of passivity and weakness. With this necessity upon them, they cannot compete with men in the more active callings of life,— or, if they sacrifice their motherhood and their womanhood to pursue them, they only lose the greater to gain the less. With this greatest and grandest of all human works, the bringing-forth and nurturing of men to bless the world, no other work of woman can be compared. Let her only point to a family of bright and happy and well-trained children, saying with the Roman matron, "These are my jewels,"— and she need envy no coronets of gems that glitter upon the heads of queens. Every theory which ignores the necessity and dignity of this work, or aims to put upon it the stamp of inferiority, not only proclaims itself, by that very act, futile and irrational, but tends to unsettle all right ideas of human relations and to disorganize and destroy society. They who would secure freedom from this work that God has laid upon them, with the idea that a public career is more noble, secure it only by denying their sex and putting contempt upon true womanhood. And the great accusation which we bring against the Woman's Rights movement is that, whether consciously or not, it proceeds upon the assumption that there is a higher life for woman than that of the family and the home, that there is no difference of obligation arising from sex, no subordination of woman's office and calling to that of men, in fine, no real womanhood as distinguished from manhood.

It has been the fancy of some that, as civilization lifted up the female sex, the differences of character and of occupation between woman and man might wholly disappear. Aside from the objection, which ought to count much with such persons, that if this were so there are a thousand rough and menial occupations which would fall to woman's share, and so her fancied advance be only a degradation, it may be said also that all experience shows a growing difference between the sexes, instead of a growing likeness, as civilization advances. The lower down you get in the scale of civilization, the smaller are the differences between the outward work of woman and man, and between his mind and hers. In Switzerland and Germany you may see any day hundreds of women digging and wheeling earth for railroad embankments. And, while the woman digs and plows in the fields, the man not unfrequently knits or cooks at home. The one is as rough and masculine as the other ; they have nearly the same dress ; you cannot tell one voice from the other, and they exchange works with little or no sense of impropriety. So it is in all rude and early stages of society. But, in an advanced civiliza-

tion, the differences of sex become more marked. Woman's voice becomes softer, her face and hands more delicate, her dress more elaborate, and with this outward change there is an inward change corresponding. There is the old progress of the married pair from homogeneity to heterogeneity, from likeness to difference. The idea that woman is to be more like man in the progress of civilization is all a delusion, since it is only in civilization that the more subtle characteristics of the sexes are made manifest. And the more woman is civilized, the less she desires to be like man,— the less possible it is for her to be like man. Civilization and Christianity bring her up gradually, from her slavish subjection and oppression, to a place where her natural equality is recognized and respected,— but they will only make her more truly woman, not more nearly man. Her subordination of office will be more and more perfectly seen in the Christian humility and gentleness and endurance of her character, and in her indisposition to assume the place or do the work of man. In the very creation of mankind in the garden of beauty, undefiled by the slimy track of the serpent as it was, God ordained the subordination of women and the differences of nature that make that subordination inevitable ; and it is the greatest heresy of modern radicalism to denounce as barbarism this divinely appointed relation of the sexes. Dr. Bushnell tells us that the Buddhist women of China, who believe that they existed as dogs and cats before they came into this world, and call their present despised condition as women by the name of the "bitterness," earnestly pray their god Buddha to grant them his favor, that in the next transmigratory state they may enter upon life in the position of men, and of men in good circumstances. Have we actually fallen upon a time when women so little value the dignity and privileges of womanhood, as to seek even in this life to be no longer women, but men? Napoleon said that the great need of France was good mothers. Is it possible that women can conceive that it lies nearer their true powers and duties to be good politicians?

I fear, too, the effect of these fundamental heresies upon the marriage bond. When you look upon woman as only a second edition of man, you lose the true idea of marriage as the unity of two different personalities. Marriage is a very different thing from the union of two friends, or the partnership of two merchants. It is the bringing together of two halves, and the making of them one, of halves that greatly differ from each other. Man and woman are complements to each other, and the entire rounded being is only made up by the united life of the two. Therefore it is a union for life ; and the violation of faith on either side cuts at the very root of all morality. It is a union constituted by God, and dissoluble only by his hand in death. Now the moment you make woman to be man, forgetting that she is not identical with man but different, that moment you turn marriage into a partnership, which, like some other partnerships, has no binding obligations to it, any longer than both parties are satisfied with its continuance. It is no longer a union, but a confederation, as the rebels said of our national government, and so may be dissolved at will. Wrong views of the nature and position of women lead directly and logically to this result. And in practice, it is not so far away. We have a leading woman apostle of this movement declaring that "true marriage dwells in the sanctuary of the soul, beyond the cognizance or sanction of state or church," and intimating that

unhappiness in the relation is a proper reason for seeking happiness elsewhere. I am pained to hear even John Stuart Mill saying that it is a pity not to give a woman who is the body-slave of a despot, the opportunity of trying her fortune twice. I am solicitous about the effect of the Woman's Rights agitation, not so much on account of the direct objects it seeks, as on acount of the false underlying principles which are assumed in it. We live in a time of such general migration, that the restraints of home and the care for established reputation are far too little thought of. Desertions of husbands by wives and wives by husbands, and divorces for trifling causes, have been destroying in the public mind the idea of the sanctity of marriage. And we must guard against the spread of any principles which will strengthen these evil tendencies of our day,— for the moment marriage becomes a mere partnership, womanhood is dead, and a death-blow is struck at public virtue.

And what shall we say to the claim to the suffrage which is made for woman? I am aware that many good men advocate the admission of women to the privilege of the ballot. But, while I desire to give to women the largest liberty and the widest influence which the best of the sex desire, I have most serious doubts whether both of these, as well as the interests of society, will not be compromised by conferring upon them the franchise. And that for the same reason that underlies all my former arguments, namely, that the putting of political power into the hands of women is not only contrary to any right theory of true womanhood, but contrary also to any right theory of the family. The power of rule seems to me to have been vested in the head of the family, that he may act for them, or rather that they may act through him. There is a shrinking from the publicity and collisions of politics, which seems a part of the nature of woman, and to lie down deeper than the effects of education or circumstances. The law, that seems to some so faulty, has caught a glimpse of the fact that man and wife are one, and that the individual is not the true unit of civil society, but the family. If I am not mistaken, the whole argument for the suffrage rests upon the unconscious assumption that a woman is a man, instead of constituting in her normal relations a part of a higher unity — a unity in which she is a part and man is a part, but of which he, by virtue of his office, as man and as head, is the proper representative. But even allowing that she is the same as man, does it follow that the possession of humanity gives a natural right to the ballot? Not so, for if this were true, all might vote,— the fact that one was a human being would determine the right to the franchise. But children do not vote; the sick and the absent do not vote; the criminal and the insane do not vote. Others vote as their representatives,— or rather, their interests are represented by those whom the state allows to vote. A whole half of the male population do not vote at all. Voting then is not a natural right, for government is representation, and only those vote to whom society thinks it for its best interests to grant the franchise. Women then have no right to the suffrage, simply on the ground that they are a part of humanity. If they have the privilege of voting, it must be because society thinks it for the interest of women themselves and for the interest of the State that they should vote, and so has actually conferred the privilege upon them.

When it comes to the question of expediency and advantage, also, the preponderance of argument is against it. Add to the pernicious effect upon

the family of making the married pair two instead of one, the other dangers of destroying all the dignity and delicacy of womanhood in primary meetings and party caucuses,— add female corruption and intrigue, such as we have seen recent specimens of at Washington, to the already serious evils of our political situation,— intensify political bitterness and strife by that feeling of partizanship which belongs more to women than to men,— and I think we can see only evil in the measure. It is said that the presence of women will refine and adorn our elections and public councils. But women are naturally not so much better than men,— the same publicity of life and mingling with the rude and boisterous crowd would after a time take the edge off from their manners and neutralize their influence. A great part of women's refining influence hitherto has been due to the fact that they have not been accustomed to a public life. Whether their purifying power could long withstand the corruptions of modern politics is more than doubtful. Besides all this, it seems to me that neither they nor the State at large need their votes. They do not need these votes to protect their own rights. Their husbands and brothers are ready to give these to them. They are not without representation. Those they love best are their representatives. To admit them to the franchise is to declare that men and women are two different classes upon the same level, whereas the truth is, these two classes are, both in theory and in practice, one. In the vote of the husband, the wife bears her part of silent and powerful influence,— in the votes of men, the whole class of women is represented also. When one of our late reformers said she did not care to vote, if she only might talk, she unconsciously and by accident gave the true solution of the whole matter. Woman's place is not that of direct political power, but of indirect influence through those who wield the power.

It has been common to scout the Bible, as antiquated and worn out, and to deny it any place in deciding upon the claims of modern philosophies and reforms. But there is a constant surprise and gratitude to the Christian as he sees how the principles of Scripture, enunciated so many thousand years ago, are still applicable to these days in which we live, throwing the most vivid light upon human relations and setting before us most clearly the way of personal duty. I have aimed to make my treatment of this subject a simple application, to one of the most perplexing questions of our time, of the old truth of God. I may have failed to convince you, but I trust we have seen that while woman can claim equality with man in nature, she misses her true place and work when she forgets that she is different from him, and in office subordinate to him. She gains most herself, and does most for others, when she recognizes this divine order and accepts the place of man's helper, without aspiring to fill that of man himself.

The Woman's Rights Convention, which held its sessions in this city during the past week, adopted a series of resolutions among which I find the following: "Resolved, that as the duty of every individual is self-development, the lessons of self-sacrifice and obedience taught woman by the Christian church have been fatal, not only to her own highest interests, but through her have also dwarfed and degraded the race." And then come two others in which, if I do not misunderstand them, woman is urged to take reason instead of revelation for her guide, make the present life instead of

the future the object of her care, and so escape from the subjugating influences of priestcraft and superstition. And yet all that woman has she owes to Christianity, and all that she has won has been won by the increasing power of this very gospel of self-sacrifice, which she is now called upon to reject. So fatuous and ruinous are counsels of those who prefer the light of an unsanctified reason to that which streams from the word of God. I am glad that Frederick Douglass had the judgment to point out that self-development and self-sacrifice are not inconsistent with each other. The Convention passed these resolutions, but they do not express the sentiments of the true friends of woman, they do not express the sentiments of true women themselves. Self-development through self-sacrifice, this is not only the law of woman's being,— it is the law of all being — even that of the Son of God,— and, when woman forgets it, she casts away her crown. Her true place and work is that of man's helper. This she may be in the married state, and doubtless here her highest work and most lasting influence reside. But, whether she be married or not, she still may in a most true sense be man's helper. With many holy ministries of counsel, of admonition, of invitation, of example, she may elevate, refine, purify, society; she may relieve distress, and stimulate to noble achievement; she may point the young and the old alike to Jesus her Savior. And here, in this spiritual help, the glory of every true woman lies. She can speak, when others words would not be heard. She can reach depths of the soul by the tones of her voice, and the modesty of her demeanor, and the clearness of her faith, which men cannot reach. Oh, let these powers be used for Christ, in the family, in the Sabbath school, in the social circle, and many of you, my sisters, may have the joy of welcoming sinners to the kingdom of God. "With works such as these"— I quote from Adolph Monod's sermon on the Life of Woman —"with works such as these to do, are you jealous of still greater works reserved for others? Let me wake in you a holy jealousy,— let me lead you to appreciate the position in which God has placed you. Conform yourselves to his views, without a word of complaint or regret; and, putting away all ambitious views of change, cherish a joyful fidelity to your peculiar mission, and a heart which envies nothing but a more active charity and a more profound humility. Woman, in fine, whoever thou art and wherever thou art, take to thy heart this word: 'I will make for him an helpmeet,' and determine, without more delay, to justify the definition which God has given of thee!"

XLI.

WOMAN'S WORK IN MISSIONS.*

I should greatly feel the honor of addressing this assembly of Christian women, if I were not so deeply impressed with the responsibility. I have been awed as I have gone into the engine-room of an ocean steamer, and have looked at the lever which could unlock its sources of strength and set the great vessel moving on its way. That lever I should have hardly dared to touch. So I feel, as I stand before this Woman's Missionary Society. It is a solemn thing to influence, in any degree, the movement of these forces for good. I do not flatter myself that I can add to the wisdom of your counsels. I shall be content, if I can give to these earnest workers before me some new stimulus and hope. And this I can best do by speaking to you first of the great things which Christ has done for woman, and then of the great things which woman may do for Christ.

Think for a moment what woman was in ancient society, and what she is now in heathen lands, and you will see how much she owes to Christ. There was the general polygamy of the nations of the East, which made woman only the toy and slave of man, and which, while it degraded her intellect and depraved her heart, made true conjugal affection and family peace impossible. Among the Greeks, though there was but one wife, the wife was still in a state of perpetual subjection. In Athens, she was allowed no true education or instruction; was permitted only scant intercourse with her nearest relations, and even with her own husband,—lived indeed in a separate part of the house from him, and was dependent for her principal society upon her slaves. The husband found his advisers and confidants among educated courtesans, and these held an actually higher place in social esteem than the lawful wife. The wife was treated all her life long as a minor,—the widowed mother, instead of being the guardian of her own children, herself fell to the guardianship of her eldest son. And, to crown the whole, the husband might put away his wife at will, and at any time take another younger, and fairer, and richer. In Rome, the stricter form of marriage put the wife completely at the mercy of the husband, giving him, as despot of the family, even the power of life and death. But this form of marriage had one advantage—it could not be easily dissolved. The commoner form was dissoluble upon the slightest pretexts. Caius Sulpicius Gallus divorced his wife because she had gone into the street without a vail. Cicero repudiated his first wife, in order to take a wealthier; and put away this second, because she was not sufficiently sorry for his daughter's death. Woman came to be so despised that the Censor Metellus, 170 years before

* An Address before the Annual Convention of the American Women's Baptist Missionary Society, delivered in the First Baptist Church, Rochester, April 18, 1883.

Christ, had gone so far as to say in public: "Could we but exist as citizens without wives, we should all be glad to get rid of such a burden." And yet these things existed in Athens and Rome, at the very height of their civilization.

See what woman's condition is even now, in heathen lands, and you get some idea of what Christ has done for woman where the light of the gospel has come. It is the life of eighteen centuries ago brought down to this generation,— not one of its sorrows alleviated, not one of its outrages on womanhood outgrown. Still woman is the drudge and burden-bearer of man, or she is the mere instrument of his passion and the means of his greater degradation. Take the nations of the far East among whom our missions are established. The wife never sits by the side of her husband at the family meal,— she must stand by in silence to wait upon her betters. Only after her husband, and her sons too, have eaten, is she permitted to sit down to the remnants of the feast. She never walks by his side. She must follow after him, as if she were his menial servant and dependent. Instead of sharing in his plans and thoughts, stimulating his labors, and feeling that a part of his triumphs are her own, she must be content to know, only as a slave knows, of his purposes and his success. The blessed relation of confidence and equality which makes husband and wife in Christian lands mutual helpers of each other in everything noble and pure; the hallowed joy of a Christian home in which the wife reigns, with her husband, like a queen upon an equal throne; the respect and reverence of the members of a Christian family, as they do little acts of duty to the mother of the household,— all this the heathen woman knows nothing of. Nothing is before her in life but the silly idle routine of a favorite, closely watched and guarded, or the unrewarded round of hopeless drudgery, varied only by the frequent cruelty of an arbitrary master. With no resources of education to furnish food for thought, and with no religious knowledge but the dreadful phantoms of an idolatrous worship, life is only a weary mockery and show, from which death itself, if it were not for heart-freezing fears of the future, would be a glad relief.

All this in civilized and semi-civilized lands. But, as you get further from Christianity, the condition of woman becomes more desperate. There are savage tribes like the Koussa Kaffirs, where there is absolutely no feeling of love in marriage. In Australia, women are treated with the utmost brutality, beaten and speared in the limbs on the most trivial provocation, so that few women can be found free from frightful scars upon the head, or the marks of spear-wounds upon the body. In Tahiti, infanticide prevailed to such an extent before the gospel was preached there, that the missionaries considered that not less than two-thirds of the children were murdered by their parents. Mr. Ellis says: "I do not recollect having met with a female in the islands during the whole period of my residence there, who had been a mother while idolatry prevailed, who had not imbrued her hands in the blood of her offspring." Among the Fijians, the mothers themselves were killed as soon as they began to feel the approach of old age, having only their choice of being strangled or buried alive. Mr. Hunt tells us that a young man among them came to him and invited him to attend his mother's funeral, which was just going to take place. He accepted the invitation and

joined the procession, but, surprised to see no corpse, he made inquiries, when the young man pointed out his mother, who was walking along with them, alive and well. On Mr. Hunt's expressing his astonishment, the young Fijian replied that she was old, that his brother and himself had thought she had lived long enough, that they had made her death-feast and were now going to bury her. Mr. Hunt did all he could to prevent so diabolical an act, but the only reply he received was that she was their mother and they her children, and that they ought to put her to death. A little further on they came to a grave, already dug; the mother sat down, and all her children and grandchildren took leave of her; a rope made of twisted tapa was then passed twice around her neck by her sons, who took hold of it and strangled her; after which she was put in her grave and buried, with the usual ceremonies.

If this picture of what women can become without the gospel were only the picture of a present reality, it would not be so frightful, but let us remember that it is self-perpetuating. As the mothers are, so are their children. Degraded and savage mothers reproduce themselves in their offspring,—the benighted and besotted mind of the mother is the spring of blindness and cruelty and misery without end, not only to her female but to her male descendants. And when we consider how many such mothers there are, how incalculably great seems the evil of woman's present condition and the consequences of corruption and death that flow therefrom! "Remember," says Mr. Bainbridge, "that 200,000,000 women are living in the only Buddhist hope beyond this world, of perhaps being born again a man instead of a toad or a snake; that 90,000,000 women more are in the most abject slavery, body and soul, to their Hindu lords; and that still 80,000,000 more are in Moslem harems, unloved, uncared for, but as slaves of passion, and certainly expecting to be supplanted in the dismal remnant of their conjugal affections by 'the black-eyed houris' promised to the faithful in Mahomet's paradise."

And yet, to use the language of a noble Christian woman, "according to present appearances, these seething masses are to go on from generation to generation, constantly repeating and deepening their degradation. More than four hundred millions of women still in heathen darkness! It is difficult to comprehend so large a number, but let one of these young ladies stand at this church door and spend the working hours of each day in counting this vast multitude as they pass by her at the rate of one every second, sixty every minute, thirty-six hundred every hour, and her hair would be gray and the light of youth gone from her eye before the last of these benighted, sin-stricken sisters of hers would have filed past. Thirty thousand women, capable of purity and love and education and lofty thought and all of the Christian experience that brings us into such tender relation to Christ and enables us to call a holy God, Father — thirty thousand of these women every day are dropping into a grave only a little darker than the life they leave. In life, they are shut out from all that makes life desirable to you, Christian mother or wife or daughter." In death, they are buried in a heathen's grave, while the immortal part, consciously guilty and full of fears, enters in terror upon a hopeless eternity.

From all this, Christian women, Christ by his blessed gospel has delivered

you. He delivered you from it, first, by honoring and consecrating woman's nature when he was born of a woman. He might have come into the world in other ways than this, descending like some bright-winged angel, or light-footed Apollo, to the earth. But no, he saw the suffering, down-trodden, crushed and broken-hearted sex, whose crown of glory had fallen, and the whiteness of whose robes was draggling in the mire, and it entered his heart so to distinguish this sorrowful and sinning womanhood, that it might be lifted up again from its degradation, and gain a dignity and glory that should more than counterbalance all the misery and shame of its former fall. And so from the flesh of Mary the Virgin he took his own human flesh, in the eyes of all the world sanctifying and ennobling that motherhood which had been before accounted only woman's mark of inferiority and weakness. Thus motherhood has been made sacred, and woman has come to be honored for the sake of it. In the Tribune of the Pitti Palace at Florence I saw the statue of the Venus de' Medici, the best representation in sculpture of the classic type of beauty. It had come down from pagan antiquity — the undraped form of a woman — the statue of an unchaste goddess, fashioned, it may be, as many such statues were, after the living form of some noted harlot in the days of Pericles. It did not seem to be an accident that directly above the statue, and near it on the wall, there hung that loveliest of all of Raphael's creations, the Madonna della Seggiola, that picture of the Virgin and the infant Savior, upon which no spectator looks without new reverence for woman and new conceptions of the way in which that mighty mission of bearing upon her bosom the Son of God has consecrated and exalted her. The two works of art are separated by an infinite moral distance, though so close together, and they show what woman is without Christ, and with him. The most beautiful statue of woman that pagan antiquity can furnish us is the undraped statue of a harlot. The picture of the mother of Jesus, clothed and in her right mind, and clinging with motherly devotion to the wondrous child she holds in her blessed arms, shows us, in its matchless dignity and purity and sweetness, what woman is, now that the incarnation of Christ has given to her once more her lost sceptre and glory. Henceforth none may enslave her or despise her, since the Son of God has bestowed on her such honor. Just in the proportion that civilization retrogrades, as in France, to the pagan skepticism and sensualism, just in that proportion is woman remanded to her old position in classic times, and is treated only as an animal and a servant. Just in proportion as civilization is pervaded with Christian ideas, does wifehood and motherhood become the object of men's reverence and devotion.

Christ has delivered woman from degradation, again, by dying for her and by thus showing the value of her soul, and her religious equality with man. Heathen religions had declared that woman had no soul. The Rabbins had so far perverted the teachings of the Old Testament Scriptures as to discourage, if not absolutely to forbid, the religious instruction of women. But, in opposition to all this, Jesus taught the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, and Mary, the sister of Lazarus, as she sat at his feet in the house; declared, of her who put the two mites into the treasury, that she had cast in more than they all; accepted the ministrations of women in his journeyings; made them the first publishers of his gospel after his resurrection. Thus he

made known the fact that his death was suffered for all the human race, not for men only but for women also, and that salvation was offered not to persons of one sex only, but to every creature. How great a change this made in the condition of woman, to be treated as a rational and immortal being, whose soul was of enough value to be worth the sacrifice of the Son of God, we may try to imagine but can hardly fully comprehend. I know that there was a Teutonic reverence for woman — the relic, as I believe, of her original God-given rights and dignity — and that this helped on the influence of Christianity when it sought to restore her to her place. But I also know that the German tribes, in contact with the debased civilization of Rome, would have lost that reverence, if the religion of Christ had not furnished it with a new motive and ground. That motive and ground were found in the death of Christ. That the Lord of glory should die for her and should give to her his infinite Spirit, that she should be admitted on an equal footing to all the privileges of his church, and commissioned as a fellow-helper in the propagation of his gospel, was a spectacle almost as striking as the breaking down of the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile,—indeed was an earlier declaration of the same principle, that henceforth nothing should be called common or unclean. And so the women of Christian lands, whether they honor this Savior in their hearts or not, whether they openly profess his name or refuse to acknowledge him, can never rid themselves of their obligation to him. All that they have of social privilege and respect, standing as they do, side by side with their brothers or husbands instead of waiting behind them, the unpitied victims of scorn and abuse, all this they owe to the death of Jesus for them. That death put honor and dignity upon all human souls,— that death decided the religious equality of the sexes,— that death lifted woman up to the place from which she first was taken, nearest to man's side and closest to his heart.

Once more only,— Jesus has delivered woman by living for her, as well as dying for her. I refer particularly to his exaltation of the passive virtues, in his precept and example. Before his coming, men honored the active virtues, and called them manly. Courage, energy, strength, ambition,— these were glorified. But the passive virtues — patience, meekness, tenderness, humility — these were thought unmanly, and men scorned them, as mere weakness. But these were the virtues of a full half of human kind,— in scorning these they scorned woman, God's last and best creation. And so man lost immeasurably in his own character, and treated woman with hideous injustice, and yet called it just. Now have you ever thought how much Christ did for woman by combining her virtues with man's, and by giving to the world, in his own character, the perfect image of them both? Thus Christ became the perfect representative of humanity,— all virtues and graces, whether manly or womanly, meet and blend in him. Before the minds of men there is the picture of the living Jesus as he walked in Palestine, with his patient biding of his time, his tender sympathy for all distress, his shrinking from the public eye, his meek sufferance under injuries sore and unprovoked, his matchless forgiveness to those who deserved his wrath. And so in his precepts. He did not exalt and dignify the self-asserting and combative qualities,— the world had made idols of them, and would idolize them without his help,— but he uttered his blessing mainly upon those vir-

tues which had been so forgotten that they had almost ceased to be virtues — the passive virtues, which seem most natural and find their highest development in woman. "Blessed are the poor in spirit, the meek, the merciful, the hungering and thirsting after righteousness, the pure in heart, the persecuted." Even skeptics have noticed with wonder the utter unlikeness of all this to the standards of society in Jesus' time. "Have you observed," says Renan, in a letter to Strauss, "how there is absent from the beatitudes all mention or praise of what we call the warlike virtues?" Ah, it was a deeper wisdom than Renan or Strauss can comprehend — wisdom that would add, to all virtues recognized before, a whole class which the world had hitherto despised. To the masculine qualities of a noble soul were added by Christ those which up to that day had been considered distinctively feminine, so that henceforth the two must go together. And so, all that was beautiful in chivalry was the result of Jesus' teaching, and the meekness and patience which chivalry never showed are coming to be recognized as elements of the truest character. All this has turned to the advantage of woman. Exalting men's esteem of that which is so commonly feminine has exalted woman herself. That which once was thought her weakness and shame has, through Christ's precept and example, come to be considered her real glory, till now a Christian civilization accords to her a place and an influence, different in kind from man's, yet equal to man's own, and man himself delights to own her gentle and persuasive sway.

Thus we have followed woman from the depths of her ancient sorrow and shame to the blessed heights which she now occupies, and have seen that she owes all this advancement to Christ. Oh, how infinite is her debt to him! How shall she ever repay it? There is a way in which she may at least testify her gratitude — by using these new-found powers and this widening influence for the extension to others of the blessings which she herself is permitted to enjoy. Oh, Christian women! the history of this Society is witness that you cannot look down from this height of privilege upon the dark masses of your oppressed and benighted sisters in heathen lands, without feeling that you are debtors to them all, to carry or to send to them this same priceless gospel. In these late years, God has been moving by his spirit upon the hearts of Christian women in America, as he never has moved upon them before, showing them that they have a work of their own to do, and peculiar gifts and qualifications for the doing of it. Woman's work for woman in heathen lands — this has become a watchword and an inspiration to thousands in other denominations as well as ours. Presbyterians and Methodists, indeed, have gone before us, and, by their zeal and success in organizing the women of their churches for this special work, have demonstrated how great a power resides in the Christian women of every denomination, which is yet unused, but which by combination may be made to tell with wonderful effect in raising from their misery the millions of women on the other side of the world.

Every one of you knows that the great obstacle to the success of general preaching, in many heathen countries, is the seclusion of the female portion of the community. Women, especially of the better classes, are not permitted to appear in public,— the preacher does not see them in his congregations, and he is not admitted to their homes. And yet, while the women

are unreached, there is a mighty barrier in the missionary's way. Let the men of a community be impressed by the preaching of the gospel, yet the influence of the wives upon them and upon their children is mightier than that of the missionary. The heathen mother makes a heathen household, whatever the husband and father may be. Many intelligent Mohammedans are beginning to see that their women should have some education and refinement, for the sake of their sons. Archbishop Hughes said once: "Let me have the children of the country under my instruction, until their seventh year, and I will defy you to get them away from me thereafter." So let heathen mothers carry their little children to the feet of the great idol, to bow and offer flowers before it, and the influence of that early training will be almost impossible to overcome. If we would evangelize a land, we must make the mothers, as well as the fathers, Christian,— only when Christianity takes root in the family is it safe, and sure of perpetual growth. Now who can reach these heathen mothers? Men? No, not men, but women. Women must carry to them the gospel — not in the formal way of preaching, but by visiting them in their homes, ministering to them in their sickness, comforting them in their afflictions, and then pointing the way to him who is the greater Comforter and Savior. The blessing which has attended the Zenana work — the work of female missionaries in the private apartments of heathen women — shows that women have qualifications and advantages for certain sorts of evangelizing effort, such as men have not, and never can expect to have. By the teaching of children who otherwise would be brought up in all the demoralizing ideas and customs of paganism, by readings of the Scriptures to knots of girls and women assembled together, by self-sacrificing ministrations to their own sex in time of sickness and need, women can be an unspeakable blessing to their degraded sisters, and can open new doors through which may enter into great nations the healing and saving influences of the gospel of Christ.

Much of this work must be done, if done at all, by unmarried female missionaries. The wives of missionaries already on the field have their peculiar family cares, and their duties lie mostly in their own homes. Our general society, the Missionary Union, to which this is auxiliary, already provides for these women with their husbands. The other work of sending out and supporting unmarried women who can give their whole time to labors among those of their own sex — this work demanded a new agency, and the agency has been found in the Woman's Missionary Society. All honor to those who first conceived the plan and to those who have so nobly executed it! The 36 missionaries and 48 Bible women whom you are now supporting; the 86 schools you have aided, with their 3,294 pupils; your 400 mission bands with their 8,000 members; your 1,000 mission circles with their 2,500 contributors; and the $54,000 you have collected for the work in a single year, in addition to the funds raised by the Society of the West,— this is a record that provokes our praise and gratitude. Here is a great work done abroad. But it is also plain that there has been a great work done at home. Not all Christian women can go abroad. But all Christian women may pray and give that others may go. They may combine and organize, so that their interest in women abroad may be not only increased, but also utilized and made the means of definite and positive good. It is not every

Christian woman who gives at all to the cause of missions. The wives and daughters of Christian men too often hide themselves behind their husbands or fathers, and think it enough that they should give in their stead. It is of inestimable importance that these reserves should be called out, and that they should have a part in the battle. I count it a vast gain, when I see set on foot a plan which aims at nothing less than bringing the million and a half of Baptist women in this land to feel their individual responsibility for the conversion of their heathen sisters across the sea, and to give even the least weekly or yearly sum to bring about the great result.

I believe that, in this Women's Missionary movement, the rock has been smitten, and a spring has begun to flow that will go on forever. Can any one think that when God once stirs the great woman's heart of our churches, that heart will ever cease to beat in sympathy with the wants and woes of her suffering sisters, or to yearn for the salvation of these millions who are too far gone in their degradation and sin to make any struggle for deliverance? No, my sisters, this work is of God, begun never more to cease till the last heathen woman is lifted from her misery, and rejoices in the saving grace of Christ. How mighty the field that is before you,— how vast the responsibility laid upon your hands! But, mighty as is the field, and vast as is the responsibility, Christ's call comes to you to go forward, and he himself goes with you. He has called you only because it is his purpose to make you the means of converting the women of the world to him, only because it is his purpose to give you the ultimate salvation of these millions as the reward of your labor and the answer of your prayers. Let no work to which Providence opens the way seem too great for you. Let no blessing to the myriads of your lost sisters for which his Spirit prompts you to pray, seem too vast to plead for in his name. Take upon your hearts the burden of this great world's guilt and trouble, as that Syro-Phœnician woman took upon herself the burden of her daughter's disease and pain,— identify yourselves with it, and bearing it to Christ as if it were your own personal sorrow, say to him as that woman did: "Lord, help me!" Who knows but he may say to you as he said to her: "O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee, even as thou wilt!"

XLII.

THE EDUCATION OF A WOMAN.*

It is an honor to be permitted any share, however humble, in such Anniversary exercises as these. As a fellow-worker from an adjoining field, I come to congratulate both teachers and scholars here upon the results of another rounded year of labor. Some of these results are visible, and we see them before us. Many more are not open to casual sight, but are all the more permanent and valuable. The teacher's reward is not so much in the present, as in the future. As Jean Paul says of the obscure teachers of village schools: "They fall from notice like the spring blossoms, but they fall that the fruit may be born." So, as I look about me upon these many evidences of thorough and successful work, and reflect that all this patient endeavor and achievement has gone to the widening of mental view, the training of faculty, and the building up of character, I am filled with rejoicing that such institutions exist, and that such teachers devote to them the unselfish service of their lives.

And yet, it is not merely the assurance of my reverent regard that I would extend to-day. I would, if possible, give some help also. Lofty estimates of others' work are more cheering, if they are accompanied by something that shall make the practical problems of that work more comprehensible, or its prosecution more inspiring. It would be presumptuous for one whose thoughts have been mainly occupied in another sphere of inquiry to assume to settle any of the vexed questions here. And yet the subject of The Education of a Woman is one upon which each of us may well have thoughts of his own. Let me venture, even in the presence of those whose practical experience has been far greater than mine, to give you a few results of my reflections.

The most difficult problem of education in general is, how at once to store the mind, and to set the mind to work. Reception on the one hand, and mental gymnastics on the other,—the filling of the furnace, and the fusing of the ore. Education certainly implies this last. Etymologically, as you know, the word means a "drawing forth," and it implies that the mind has in it certain hidden capacities or powers, which by appropriate means can be drawn forth in exercise or use. Now there is important truth here. Education is a process of eliciting the inner aptitudes of the soul, and training them to harmonious and effective action. Discipline is one of its most obvious implications. But you are well aware that it is possible to carry this idea too far. There are certain doctrinaires who would make discipline the be-all and end-all of education. They would develop the mind by taxing it,

* An Address delivered at the Commencement of the Granger Place School, Canandaigua, Tuesday morning, June 20, 1882.

just as you bring out the elasticity of a rubber band by stretching it. Within are inexhaustible fountains, they would say; all you have to do is to draw upon them. Out of itself the mind will spin you a web, as the spider does. It may criticise and compare what comes to it from without, but all real material of knowledge is from within. And this scheme reaches its acme and best illustration in the idealistic philosophy, which regards the external world as merely the inward creation of him who thinks it — constructed only out of "such stuff as dreams are made of."

The German Christlieb has well expressed the fundamental error of this way of thinking, when he says: "Reason is not a material source of knowledge, but a faculty without concrete contents." You cannot expect to get anything out, unless you first put something in. Involution before evolution, always. Education does not consist simply in discipline. All our mechanical systems of school training need to be corrected here. Before discipline, and in order to furnish the material upon which it is to work, there must be impartation and reception of truth. Before the training and drawing forth of faculty are possible, there must be something for faculty to work upon. How do you draw out the plant? Surely not by stretching it, as you stretch the elastic band. No, you treat it as a living thing. You supply it with soil and water and sunshine. You impart to it, before you expect it to impart to you. Now the human soul is, in like manner, a living thing. It is not independent of God or of the truth. It never will create God or the universe. And yet it must be brought into contact with these, or it will never grow. This is the teacher's work — to bring truth in contact with the living mind and soul. Truth is the mind's natural nutriment and stimulus. Impartation of truth is the first part of education; the drawing out and exercise of the powers is the second.

Thus I have taken you back to the basis of all education — the truth. The teacher has the magnificent task of bringing the wide range of truth in contact with the mind, and of directing the processes of the mind as it appropriates the truth and exercises itself upon it; while the scholar has the correspondingly noble task, first, of reception from without, and then of living reconstruction from within. But now I wish you to push on with me to another point of view, and to consider that the success of education is to be tested by the scholar's ability to find truth for himself, and to be independent of his teacher. That is a very dead and mechanical view of education which conceives of it as the stamping of the seal into soft wax, — it is more nearly like the transformation of the wax into a seal. The teacher's work is not done, until the scholar is ready to be a teacher. The teacher has imparted nothing of great value, unless he has imparted the love for knowledge; the disposition to use elementary training as the instrument for further investigation; and such facility and accuracy in the processes of study, as turns them from a burden into a pleasure. How much we owe to the personal influences that have formed our youthful ambitions! Many a noble woman looks back to the teachers of this school as the source of that passion for knowledge which has elevated and refined her whole life, and many more I trust will yet go out from these walls, scorning to be mere reflectors of chance influences from without; burning after some original understanding of philosophy and science, of literature and history and art; and ready to be, under God, independent centres of thought and of motive power to others.

We sometimes speak of "the higher education,"—and we ordinarily mean by it all training beyond that of our common schools. The higher education would to most minds imply something of classical study. But I am inclined to use the phrase in a new sense, and to say that no human being, whatever he may study, passes over the line which separates the lower education from the higher, until he seeks knowledge, not from reward or from compulsion, but from an inward love. Let us call that the lower education which busies itself with youth while they are yet mainly in the receptive stage, exercising themselves for the most part upon what they have received from without, and held to their work more because they have been set there to do it, than because of any eager desire of their own. The higher education begins whenever the pupil wakes to the recognition of the slumbering possibilities of his being, and begins of his own accord to reach outward after the true, the beautiful, and the good. In the lower education, the teacher imparts knowledge as a manufactured article; in the higher, he furnishes only the raw material, and moves the pupil to manufacture for himself. In the lower, the scholar is still wholly dependent; in the higher, he has acquired something of spontaneity, and ability to conduct business for himself. There is no educated man or woman who does not remember the passage from the one stage to the other as one of the marked epochs of life, and say of it: "Then first I emerged from bondage into freedom." And the glory of these school months and years is this, that they witness these changes from the chrysalis state,—the leaving behind of childhood, and the dawn of a new intellectual life and liberty.

Receptivity and spontaneity,—these are the two things I have thus far urged as essential to true education. But I must mention another, and that is—exhaustive study within a certain limited sphere. I shall never forget my first college recitation, and the seemingly infinite number of questions which I found could be asked about one line of the Iliad. For the first time in my life I learned what it was to study a subject thoroughly,—to leave no stone unturned,—to examine it in all its relations. To learn that lesson is worth years of work. One text-book, absolutely mastered, is worth a whole library skimmed over and half forgotten. We may utter inward objurgations upon the head of the teacher who will not tolerate inaccuracy, but we bless afterwards; while the teacher who smooths over our errors and neglects we may only curse in after years. Let us set the standard of scholastic attainment so high that a tone of thoroughness shall be imparted to the whole thinking and life. Here, if I mistake not, is the fault which most educated men find with the ordinary girls' schools of our day,—they do not ground their pupils thoroughly in the elements of knowledge; and, the foundation being insecure, the superstructure cannot possibly be firm. And this is the fault of much of women's writing. There are sprightliness, imagination, clear observation, inimitable strokes of description. With a little more *thoroughness*, as another has said, all that liveliness might become literature. But habits of exactness have not been cultivated,—the one flaw spoils the diamond. Patient production under criticism, the weighing of every word, the endless labor that makes a work of art,—these things must be learned in school days, or never. I am glad that there is so much in this School that answers to this idea of intellectual honesty. Be sure that

there is no nobler praise than this for a seminary of learning, that it sends out students who know what they pretend to know. To do a few things thoroughly well,—this should be the constant aim of our modern education.

And yet, as I said a little while ago that receptivity must be complemented by spontaneity, so here I must urge that this thoroughness in a limited sphere should be complemented by a certain breadth and completeness of culture. We not only need to know everything of something, but also something of everything. It does not follow that, because I cannot, with Macaulay, "say off all my Archbishops of Canterbury," it is useless for me to know about that early Archbishop, Thomas a-Becket, or that latest of all, Archbishop Tait. Knowledge is for use, and a little of it, instead of being a dangerous thing, may save a life from poisoning, or wing God's arrows of mercy to some recalcitrant and obdurate heart. One of the great advantages of schools like this is, that the pupil sees, in classmates and in teachers alike, many varieties of excellence, recognizes and admires many traits of character and gifts of mind, the very existence of which in the world was unknown before. Conceit and egotism disappear. So too with regard to studies. We commonly get our first bent toward a new kind of knowledge by the observation of some friend's enthusiasm for it. In a generous commonwealth like that of the seminary, we learn to respect all studies which have come to occupy the heads and hearts of its citizens. Provincialism and bigotry cannot live in such an atmosphere. I know that there are curious gusts of popular opinion in such schools, and universal, though temporary, misjudgments. But these errors correct themselves after a little, and the errors themselves are not half so narrow as the prejudices of the city set or clique. Breadth of view, and a generous sympathy with all good men and all good things, can nowhere be better learned than amid the peculiar excitements and emulations of the school, under the guiding hands of calm and wise teachers, with the whole world of truth and beauty opening around one like a new creation of God.

Ought women to learn the alphabet? So Mr. Higginson asked mockingly, a few years ago. But in some antediluvian era it was doubtless asked seriously. And there are people now who ask what good there is in women's learning Conic Sections and Greek. The only answer is, that God has given to women, just as he has to men, an intellectual nature, and that this fact binds them to make the most of themselves for his glory and for the good of human kind. He has bestowed upon them a talent,—he will require his own with usury. He has put within them a desire to know,—let them venture out upon the limitless track of discovery, and make tributary all the continents of knowledge. Let them study Geometry, for nothing exists like her demonstrations to teach us what it is to have a thing proved beyond all question or peradventure. Let them study Logic to sharpen their reasoning powers, and Grammar to discipline their powers of thought. Language opens the doors into other literatures, and furnishes the material for expression. Rhetoric teaches us how to order this material aright. Astronomy tells the laws of planetary motion in the great concave above us; Geology describes the making of the world beneath our feet; Chemistry whispers of the secret constitution of the air we breathe. We study Physiology, to learn the wonderful mechanism of our bodies; Psychology, to get some idea of the

powers and processes of our minds. How shall we know the simplest facts of production and of commerce unless we have studied Political Economy; how can the past, with the lessons of its suffering and triumph, its progress and its failures, be other than a dreary blank to us, until we have read History? Is there one of these things that a woman may not, should not, know?

A bishop of the English church said, no long time ago: "Our girls are doubtless very badly educated, but our boys will never find it out." I would not advise our girls to trust him. Our boys are learning all these things, and they are beginning to be impatient of the babyish superstitions which the girls are cherishing, in place of knowledge. Girls can never be quite happy, when they suspect that boys are laughing at them. The great philosopher, Kant, tells us that women carry books, as they do watches. The watches do not go, or if they go, they go wrong. They carry them, he says, only that it may be seen that they have them. Now if I believed this were true, I should not have thought it worth while to speak to you to-day. I should scorn to appeal to the motive of vanity. I appeal to the loftier instincts of womanhood, to the desire to be true, to the love of knowledge for its own sake, to the longing to be of the highest use in the world, to the sacred ambition to attain likeness to Him in whose image we are made.

And, with this motive, I do not know what learning may not be consecrated. I believe that a young woman ought to learn everything, ought to do everything. "It is an ill mason that refuses any stone,"— so says the proverb. Thrust aside no experience or attainment as worthless,— some day it will be of value,— aye, all your life it will be of value, because it gives you confidence and the sense of power. Education, we have seen, is the drawing out, under proper nutriment and stimulus, of all the powers,— some, let us now say, with thoroughness; the rest, to the greatest extent consistent with the time at command and with the rightful claims of the more important. The young woman should know how to use her physical powers, and to keep them in working trim. Beauty itself is duty,— since health is beauty, and health is a matter of food and air and sleep and exercise. Every girl should learn to row a boat and to ride a horse. She may or may not have a voice and an ear, but she should at least learn the elements of music and be taught the correct method of singing. She may or may not possess the dramatic faculty,— she should at any rate train her elocutionary powers to a perfectly clear articulation, and learn to read aloud with propriety and expression. She may never be required to do the cooking of a family; nevertheless she ought to consider herself a helpless thing till she can make a loaf of bread. She may have her trousseau from Paris,— nevertheless she ought in an emergency to be able to make a dress. She may not be a book-keeper,— but she can easily learn to keep her household accounts; she may never be a merchant's clerk,— but she ought to know how to draw a check upon the bank, or to write a letter in simple business form. There is no need that she be a politician or a littérateur,— but one hour a day spent in judicious scanning of the morning paper, or of the last critical review, will enable her to be a perpetual source of brightness and inspiration in the family, and will make her conversation an educating, stimulating, refining influence, throughout a wide circle of friends.

You have perceived, long since, that the education I am advocating is some-

thing broader than the mere education of the school. It is nothing less than the healthful and symmetrical development of the whole being — a process which may begin in school days, but which requires for its completion the labor of a life. Much is accomplished in the school, in an informal way, that never could be done in regular classes and by set lessons. The scholar who has eyes and ears attent to learn may get in a whole stock of preparation for life, while another is only dawdling. I value not least, in a School like this, that unconscious influence of example, shed continually by teachers and older scholars upon the younger and less mature, and transforming those on whom it falls,— I mean the influence of conversation, of temper, of demeanor, of tact and skill in entertaining guests, of generalship in administration of affairs. There are young persons who get tenfold more of education from society, than they will ever get from books. What they read they forget; the living voice impresses itself upon their memories. I am not excusing the neglect of books,— that would be a grievous blunder,— I am only urging the improvement, to the utmost, of other opportunities which the school affords, side by side with its scholastic work. A modern thinker has said that the only empire freely conceded to women is that of manners, but that this is worth all the rest put together. It *is* worth all the rest put together, if by manners we mean the whole pervasive but nameless influence that breathes through movement and tone and speech and act; for out of the heart the mouth speaketh, and a good manner cannot be counterfeited, because it is the shadowy effluence of the soul itself. To say then that one of the great matters of education is the attainment of a good manner is only to say, in another form of words, that education ought to give to every woman the gentle and quiet spirit, the large and calm intelligence, the quick sympathy, the modest self-confidence, the readiness upon emergency either to serve or to command, the constant setting of the claims of pleasure beneath the claims of duty, which constitute the genuinely Christian character. It is the poet's picture over again:

> "A being breathing thoughtful breath,
> A traveler between life and death;
> The reason firm, the temperate will,
> Endurance, foresight, strength and skill;
>
> "A perfect woman, nobly planned,
> To warn, to comfort, to command;
> And yet a spirit still, and bright,
> With something of an angel light."

Let us reverently acknowledge that for the production of such scholarship as this there will have to be something more than merely human teaching. But I think that, if we do our duty, we may depend on a higher wisdom to reinforce and supplement our efforts. The large-minded womanhood of which I have been speaking has its directory and text-book in a certain venerable volume of which we know. I am sorry that the only great classic in which our American colleges pretend to give no instruction is the Bible. In Germany, with all its rationalism, it is not so. "There are two books," says Pastor Braun to the boys of his Gymnasium, "there are two books, all the ins and outs of which you must learn here,— they are Homer and the Bible." I am thankful that, in this respect, our girls' schools are commonly better than our colleges. The one book better than all books, the one book from

which more of wisdom for the conduct of life can be drawn than from any or from all others combined, that one book is the Bible. Not Homer first and then the Bible, but the Bible first, and then all other books at an infinite remove. No education can be worthy of the name, which does not fill the soul with the knowledge and love of God and of his word. That alone can rectify our imperfect standards of judgment, fashion after the highest model of character, and send us out with a divine ambition to fill the lives of others with sweetness and beauty, to comfort the church of God, and to hasten the coming of the kingdom of truth and righteousness in the earth.

Thus my thoughts with regard to woman's education have circled about the four ideas of Receptivity, Spontaneity, Thoroughness, Breadth. You have noticed that I have not regarded the education of woman as essentially different from the education of man. She is a human being before she is a woman, and nothing that affects humanity should be foreign to her. There is a common liberal education which we give to all young men, irrespective of the fact that some are to enter the law, and others to devote themselves to civil engineering. We allow some slight modification of this course, according to the vocation which one is to follow. He who is to be a physician may take a little more of Chemistry; he who is to preach may take a little more of Greek. But to all we give substantially the same course,— to all we give the elements of a liberal culture. Now woman, as she is a human being, and therefore is man in the generic sense, has a valid claim to the same liberal culture which men enjoy. As she is not a man, but possessed of peculiar aptitudes and destined to a peculiar vocation, her course of training should be modified accordingly. She is the equal of man,— let her have as great advantages as he. She is different from man,— let her education be adapted to her idiosyncrasies and to her probable future work. If she have special gifts for Astronomy, let her by all means have the opportunity to study the higher mathematics and to calculate eclipses. If her tastes however be for literature and art, let her greatest strength be put forth in these. But, whatever be the minimum of required attainment for the young man, let that same be the minimum of required attainment for the young woman. Let liberal education for the young woman imply just as much of general training as it does for the young man.

An equal education, but not co-education. Physically the young woman is the weaker. She has her nervous force more at command, so that in competition with young men she can distance them for a time, but she gains this advantage only at fearful cost. The youth of study is followed by the age of nerves. The loss of health and spirits is poorly purchased by the higher examination marks. The acting President of one of our co-educating colleges told me that in his senior class there were three young women each one of whom was better than the best of the young men, but I told him that after-years were yet to be heard from. Let the aspiring girl resolve that she will secure a training equal in quantity and quality to the best which the schools for boys can give; but then let her also lay down two fundamental principles, first, that she will never set out to be a man, and secondly, that she will never attempt to do her work in the precise way in which men do. If she does, she will grasp after the shadow only to lose the substance of power, while her sceptre of womanly persuasion and delicate sympathy

will have passed from her forever. Fifty years ago, a class of girls prepared for Harvard College and passed their Grammar School examinations as satisfactorily as the boys with whom they had been studying. They applied to President Quincy for admission. "Well, President Quincy, you feel sure the trustees will let us come, don't you?" "Oh, by no means," replied he, "this is a place only for men." Whereupon the young miss of sixteen, who had been speaker for the rest, burst into tears, and exclaimed with vehemence: "I wish I could annihilate the women, and let the men have everything to themselves!" I am glad she did not get her wish. What would have become of us, if she had? I am glad that our oldest and foremost University still prefers simultaneous education to co-education, — the offering of equal advantages to all without regard to sex, rather than the training of young women and young men together.

I am of course entirely prepared to hear that my scheme is a purely ideal one, and that, until the physical powers of young women are much greater than we see them now, and until these same young women are willing to postpone marriage a full ten years, the attainment of such a standard of education is wildly impracticable. This leads me to say that I am not unmindful of the great difficulties in the way. Let me mention some of them, and as I mention them, let me suggest methods for their removal. The first, and perhaps the chief, is found in the absurd elementary training that is now furnished equally to our boys and girls. No one who looks back to his own childhood can fail to perceive that under a competent teacher the work of his first twelve years might easily have been put into nine, and that with less of cost to nerve and brain than he actually had to pay. When we read of the training which James Mill gave to his son John Stuart, and which the historian Niebuhr received from his father, we begin to recognize that our own lack of early proficiency was not wholly due to native stupidity, but to a wrong conception on the part of our early teachers of the work to be done. At ten years of age Niebuhr knew his eight languages, and Mill was discussing logical problems with his father. The best specimens of the Kindergarten are showing how much can be accomplished in giving an elementary knowledge of natural science to children of five and six. A celebrated professor at Vassar, on a certain picnic occasion, was startled to hear his own children calling to him to come and play geology with them. They were taking a day of sport, to play over again what they played at the Kindergarten. The professor's department was a different one from that of geology, and he was obliged to confess himself too ignorant of the subject to play comfortably with his own children. The son of one of my old college teachers was looking over a text-book of chemistry. The boy's age was six years. Father and mother were both in the room, though both were busy with their own work. The small boy broke the silence with the question: "Father, do you think there is any bicarbonate of soda in the pantry?" The father without much reflection replied, "I think not, my son," and turned again to his work. A few moments passed, when the boy spoke again: "Mother, do you think there is any bicarbonate of soda in the pantry?" The mother, much more decidedly: "No, my son, I think not," and turned to her work. The boy of six pondered deeply, and at last was heard to say: "Father thinks there is none there, because he does n't know

anything about the pantry ; and mother thinks there is n't any there, because she does n't know anything about chemistry."

Improved methods of training will do much to shorten the time spent in the drudgery of acquiring mere rudiments, and will fit the child to enter upon work that will elicit interest and will be done for its own sake. I believe that there are many things which must be taught during the first five year's of the child's life or never. Among them is elocution — or at least the most important part of it, a clear articulation and a pure tone. In many an American family where final syllables are clipped, vowels shortened, and consonants half pronounced, an English nurse, with the full, clear enunciation so often found even among servants in England, would give the children simply by the unconscious influence of example and without any formal training, a lesson in elocution that a life-time would be too short to unlearn. It is a question, indeed, whether the pronunciation of the foreign languages is not best learned in childhood in the same way. One of my New York acquaintances employed a French nurse for his children, with peremptory instructions never to say to them an English word. The experiment was continued until the children did their quarreling in French, because that was most natural to them. A German nurse was then substituted for the French. The remarkable facility of the traveled and educated Russian in the speaking of languages not his own is due, not so much to any natural linguistic gift, as to this training in childhood. The child catches, as by instinct, the language that is spoken about him, whereas in later years the same acquisition would be made at great cost of time and labor, and many American parents residing on the Continent have been put out to find how much more quickly and how much more accurately their little children learned a language than they themselves did.

There has been some progress in our public schools, since we were children. It has been progress in accuracy and thoroughness, in a limited range. It is very questionable whether it has been progress in breadth, in development of thinking power, in real love for knowledge. The variety of the old curriculum was stimulating, and the teacher was apt to be wakened up by the variety of the things he taught. The modern principle of division of labor, which condemns the teacher to a narrow round, endlessly trodden, tends to make teaching mechanical. The *vivida vis* is absent from it. The result is a sort of technical learning on the part of the scholar, which has little connection with life. We have still in our schools such relics of barbarism as the compulsory writing out of a thousand words after school, as a penalty for disorder, and the compulsory learning, in their order, of a whole column of words arbitrarily following each other in the spelling-book. And as for power to write an intelligent letter, or to give account in grammatical language of a simple incident of every-day life, that is rare among the scholars of our public schools. We are all familiar with the investigation into the nature of the instruction at Quincy, Mass., which was conducted a few years ago by Mr. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., and the amazing ignorance with regard to the simplest practical matters which was found to exist among the older scholars of the public schools. The result of that exposure was the entire reconstruction of the system of public instruction, the retirement of certain fossilized officials, the abolition of the old plan of mere

memorizing from text-books, and the adoption of a new method which substitutes instruction for mere hearing of recitations, brings the personality of the teacher into living contact with the scholar, and tests the value of the student's acquirements by his power to put the principles he learns to use in ways such as he is likely to use them in after life. I am happy to say that a lady of intelligence, in one of our neighboring towns, who had become convinced of the utter inadequacy of the ordinary school methods of that town, has introduced the Quincy system there, has imported teachers who had learned the art at Quincy, has secured the building of a school-house at private expense, has seen it filled with scholars, financially prosperous, and already producing such results that children of ten seem to be further advanced in powers of thought and expression than those of fifteen used to be. When such elementary training for both boys and girls shall become common, one of the great obstacles in the way of my general scheme for the education of young women will be removed.

Another difficulty with which woman's education has to contend, is that it does not extend over a sufficient period of time. Indeed, we may say that it commonly stops just when it has fairly begun. In this respect it differs very greatly from the best training given to young men. Only when the young man has mastered the elements of knowledge, and got command of the instruments of investigation, can he be said fairly to begin to think for himself. This period usually comes at the end of the Junior year in College, when he enters upon the broader studies of the Senior. Then he perceives for the first time the use of his past acquisitions. Intellectual and Moral Philosophy, Political Economy, Constitutional and International Law, the Philosophy of History — all these give him an outlook that is novel and inspiring. Or perchance, this recognition of himself as a free-born citizen in the great republic of letters begins only with his entrance upon the studies of his chosen profession. Then first he feels himself a man, bound to form judgments for himself, and deeply interested in knowing all that can be known about the art and mystery of theology, or medicine, or law. Then he finds himself, not only in possession of the discipline needed in conducting research for himself — the result of long continued and often irksome labors, — but he has also a physique hardened and vigorous and matured — a physique which he can subject to long continued strain without fear that it will break. In fine, the conditions of a real education are now for the first time in existence, and the results of three or four years of work are surprising. The youth changes into the man. These last years are worth all the rest put together.

Compare with this the intellectual history of the young woman, even under circumstances which are apt to be considered exceptionally favorable. Until she is eighteen, nineteen, or twenty, her physical system is not in its best estate, — indeed, the dangers attending a long-continued strain upon it are very great, as is proved by the multitude of wrecked constitutions which result from our present high-pressure system of education. Until she is twenty, she has not the physical strength for the hardest study. But — what is equally important to my purpose — she has not the maturity of mind. She has quick memory, but what she learns goes as quickly from her, for lack of time to reflect upon it, and for lack of understanding of its import-

ance. She has susceptibility and enthusiasm, but these are not yet under control of a dominant purpose. She does not know what to do with her powers, even if she had the will. She reaches the age at last when she has strength of body, discipline of her powers, maturity of judgment, — the age corresponding to that at which the young man first enters upon a real self-centered growth, the age at which she herself is fairly prepared to begin study, the age when three or four years would make her thoroughly accomplished, genuinely self-reliant, broadly thoughtful, in short truly educated, — and just then and there she stops her intellectual work, turns her back on study, leaves her school, leaves behind her all this fund of discipline, and devotes herself to society and to embroidery. There is no end of young ladies who can show only a single thousand-dollar polka or nocturne as the net result of eight or nine years of musical training. And so, in more purely literary and scientific work, the tools are sharpened at great cost through years of labor, only to be allowed at the end of those years to lie and rust. Of course we know what does it all. The mind of parents and daughters alike is prepossessed with the idea that the age of twenty or twenty-two is the fit age for marriage. If the idea of fitness *for* marriage could only supersede this, it would be well for us. We have heard a great deal of advice about early marriages. They are encouraged by the public press. Well, we have the principle most fully exemplified in Siam, where a girl is betrothed at six and married at twelve. But civilization changes all this. It teaches us that the young woman should be educated, before she is married. And when we in America recognize, as fully as our English cousins do, that the fit age for marriage is not twenty, but rather twenty-five, we shall see the removal of the second great hindrance in the way of woman's education.

But now I must speak of a last hindrance, which is almost as serious. I mean the indifference of the average young woman to the means of culture within her reach. You will bear me witness that I do not regard education as a mere matter of the schools. It has to do with the whole woman, and with all life. For this reason, even those who leave school may still continue the process of self-training, — indeed no school education is of much value which does not form the habit of study, and make it a part of the very being. We shall have better educated women, when those we have are bent, school or no school, on securing the development of all their powers, on filling up the gaps in their knowledge, on knowing the *what* and the *why* in all departments of human activity. For this reason, travel is a great means of education. It forces things upon the attention which, merely read of, would not interest. Herbert Spencer has well said, that other things being equal, that individual and that nation makes greatest advance movement which has had the greatest variety of environment. Education is a very different thing from scholarship. There is a discipline of the faculties which comes from constant contact with men and women of varied temperaments and culture. By all means let us have scholarship, — but let us supplement it by knowledge of the world. Otherwise it will be narrow and unsympathetic. The educated woman may not be a scholar, but she may know the best in literature and art; may have her taste cultivated by seeing the best pictures and by hearing the best music; may have a large and loving regard for human

nature everywhere, because she has seen in it so much of good, and at the same time a power of estimating character and of distinguishing the true from the false, because her enthusiasm of humanity has been tempered by comparison of a multitude of actual examples. And here, as in the case of young men, lies the undeniable advantage of great schools. They constitute a world in themselves. Their inmates learn from one another. There is an enlargement of the individual as the individual feels merged in the great body. The silent, constant influence of the multitude of scholars is ever with us, like the pressure of the atmosphere, powerfully supporting us and furthering our effort even when we feel it least. If I could also say that these great bodies of students were free from lawlessness of opinion and of manner, I should think their influence wholly a good. It is only a qualified approbation I can give, with the admonition that the young woman who spends years of her life in such companionship should be self-centered, with principles and even manners in large degree formed, lest the school sentiment override the society sentiment, and conventionalities lose their true aspect of rationality. To become rude and mannish, to lose the gentle and quiet spirit, to learn forth-putting and egotism, this would be too large a price to pay for any merely intellectual advantage. In Mrs. Kemble's autobiography published three years ago, she tells us that more than once, when looking from her reading-desk over the sea of faces uplifted towards her, a sudden feeling seized her that she must say something from *herself* to all those human beings whose attention she felt at that moment entirely at her command, and between whom and herself a sense of sympathy thrilled powerfully and strangely through her heart, as she looked steadfastly at them before opening her lips. But she adds that on wondering afterwards what she might, could, would or should have said to them from herself, she never could think of anything but two words: "*Be good!*"

Frances Power Cobbe, in her recent essay on the fitness of woman for the ministry of the religion, quotes this remark of Mrs. Kemble as indicating that women of genius feel within them an impulse to use their powers of emotion and expression in public address. I draw from it the opposite conclusion, that the most gifted women feel the incongruity of assuming to be teachers in the pulpit or upon the platform. There were prophetesses of old, indeed; a Jean d'Arc roused France against the invader; a Mrs. Booth, of the Salvation Army, is the most effective preacher in England. But publicity must be justified, not as the rule, but as an exception to the rule. Quiet ways for the most are best. And in these quiet ways the education of a woman best proceeds. I am persuaded that it is in the power of every woman to educate herself. However small her present attainments may be, if she will but regularly devote to the reading of good literature a single hour in each day, this simple habit will in the progress of years give her an education which will qualify her to exert a real and beneficent influence on the tone of society around her. One such woman I have known. The cares of a large household have not broken in upon her devotion of this one hour to the improvement of her mind. Her example is an incitement and stimulus to the young,—her conversation is elevating to the circle in which she moves. It seems an easy thing to compass this self-education. But will the average woman of our time do it? No, she has not time. She

can spend hours in making and receiving calls, hours in the details of household management, hours in shopping and in the preparation of her dress,— but one hour a day for communion with the master minds of all time she cannot give,— it is enough for her if she succeeds in reading her Bible and in saying her prayers. Still, she that has ears to hear, let her hear. There is the ideal. She who strives after it will surely accomplish more than she who gives up the struggle is despair.

Marheinecke tells us that we need never fear that women will become too learned. Learned women, he says, only need husbands who are more learned than themselves. I wish I could assure each woman who loves knowledge that the kind fates would entangle the thread of her life with that of some man who knows more than she. But all I can promise is that she will deserve it. And whatever may betide, this stands fast,— the ambition to reach the noblest heights of womanhood, to compass the widest fields of knowledge, to wield the largest influence for good, to bring the grandest tribute of praise to him who created and redeemed mankind,— this is to attain the end of her being, and to fulfill the purpose for which God created her and sent her into the world. Each one of us is a separate creature of God, and each one's work, however solitary it may be, or however linked in with the work of others, has yet an individuality of its own, a special type of God's creative wisdom to reflect, a special destiny to fulfill. There are capacities within you which are unlike those of any other human creature; there is a task set for you to accomplish such as no angel or archangel can perform in your stead; there is an honor you can render to Him who made you which only you in all the universe can give. Wait not then for any other, but take up your burden and push on. "Trust no future, howe'er pleasant," — but act to-day. Remember that we cannot put our finger on the moment, and say: "This is present." While we say it, it is gone. There is no present,— only past and future. The world is moving down that future in one grand harmony. The universe is revolving round the throne of God, and every star is singing, as it whirls and shines. Let us not break in upon that solemn music with the jingling of "rings on our fingers and bells on our toes;" but, keeping time to the movement of the rolling anthem, let us, with God's help, add one concordant note, however faint and low, to the grand harmony of universal life!

XLIII.

REMARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE:

THE LAW OF THE STATE AND THE LAW OF SCRIPTURE.*

What is the proper attitude of the churches toward persons divorced for their own fault and then marrying again? It may give definiteness to my discussion, if I put the question more concretely. Let me instance a case, — whether it be a real one or not is nothing to my present purpose.

A man is divorced by a New York Court upon the ground of his own adultery — an adultery committed after the offender has been admitted to membership in a church, let me say, in a Baptist church; committed, however, three or four years before what he now believes to have been his real conversion. The New York statute forbids him to marry again. But immediately after this divorce, and in order to evade the prohibition of the New York law, he crosses the line into the State of Connecticut, where parties divorced for any cause may lawfully remarry, and in Connecticut he marries another wife. Bringing this second wife back at once into the State of New York, he begins preaching to a Baptist church, has apparent success in his work, and after a time applies to be regularly ordained as a Baptist minister. The question now arises; What answer the Baptist church, and the Council composed of representatives of Baptist churches, shall make to his application? I propose to examine his *status*, both according to the laws of this State and according to the law of Christ, and this, not for the sake of determining upon a particular case, so much as for the sake of setting forth the principles which should govern our ministers and our churches in their response to similar applications. This examination may suggest to us the need of more definite interpretation of our present laws, if not of important modification of them.

The Revised Statutes of New York provide that:

"No second or other subsequent marriage shall be contracted by any person during the lifetime of any former husband or wife of such person, unless the marriage with such former husband or wife shall have been annulled or dissolved for some cause other than the adultery of such person." "Every marriage contracted in violation of the provision of this section shall [with an exception where one of the parties has been absent five years, *etc.*] be absolutely void." (2 *Rev. Stat.*, 139, § 5).

At first sight this statute would seem to settle the legal *status* of the person whose case we are considering, and to determine that he is now living with a person who, according to the laws of this State, is not his wife. And so certain of the Courts of inferior jurisdiction have decided. In the case of *Marshall vs. Marshall* (2 *Hun*, 238), Mr. Justice Westbrook, of the

* Printed in the Examiner, February 17 and February 24, 1881.

Supreme Court, held to be null and void a marriage contracted in Pennsylvania by a man who had been previously divorced in New York for his own adultery, and who immediately after his remarriage in Pennsylvania resumed his residence in this State. The principle was here asserted that the validity of a marriage is to be determined, not by the law of the place where the marriage is contracted, but by the law of the place which constitutes the domicile or actual residence of the parties who contract the marriage. Judge Davis concurred in this opinion, though Judge Daniels, for reasons which we shall consider hereafter, dissented.

On the last Wednesday of the year just closed, in New York city, as the newspapers inform us, Judge Sedgwick, in the case of *Gould H. Thorp vs. Laura M. Thorp*, followed this majority opinion of the general term just mentioned, and dismissed the suit for divorce on the ground that the marriage was itself void. Mr. Thorp was first married in 1855. In 1861 the couple was separated by absolute divorce, and several years later Mr. Thorp, though lying under the prohibition of the New York Court, married in Philadelphia the defendant in the present suit. By Judge Sedgwick's decision, the defendant has not been a wife. In a similar case in North Carolina, where a divorced wife, in order to evade the North Carolina law, went into another State and there married, the marriage was declared null and void (*Williams vs. Oates*, 5 *Iredell, N. C.*, 535).

In all these cases, the decisions of the Courts have implied that the mere transfer of one's person or of one's goods to another State for the purpose of securing a divorce does not give a man domicile in that State, nor alter in the least the claims of his own State law upon him. This principle a New Jersey Court has affirmed in determining upon an application for divorce, refusing to regard as domiciled in New Jersey any suitor whose manifest purpose in sojourning in that State is only to get a divorce (*Winship vs. Winship*, 1 *C. E. Green*, 107–110). It is a settled rule of law that there can be no jurisdiction without domicile, and it may be safely asserted as an inference from it, however Legislatures or Courts may have been tempted to ignore it, that in order to give the applicant for divorce a standing in the Courts of any State, there must be the fixed purpose of not returning to the place of his original residence, in case this residence was previously in another State (Bishop, *Marriage and Divorce*, 2 : 122).

To make my statement more complete, it should be mentioned that in 1879 the Legislature of New York so modified the law of divorce, as to grant the guilty party liberty to marry again, upon furnishing to the Court decreeing the divorce sufficient proof that the complainant has remarried, that five years have elapsed from the date of the decree, and that the conduct of the defendant since the decree has been uniformly good (*Laws of New York*, 1879 : 321). This modification of the statute has been so recent that only a single case has, to my knowledge, thus far come before our Courts. Though this case is a very different one from that which we are examining, there is a lesson to be learned from it which may help our present investigation.

In December, 1879, on petition of one Green, who had been divorced for his own adultery, and who professed to bring evidence of five years's subsequent good conduct, Judge Gilbert, of Brooklyn, granted the applicant liberty to marry again. It was afterwards found that prior to his divorce

he had already married again, and that after the divorce from the first wife he had deserted the second. His application to the Court for permission to marry again was made in order that he might marry yet a third person, who at the time had a husband still living with whom he had agreed to "trade wives." I am happy to say that, upon these facts being represented to the Court, the permission to remarry was revoked. But the case shows the ease with which, especially in a great city, evidence of so-called "good conduct" can be procured by very immoral persons, and what shameful results may follow even the partial repeal of our only penalty for adultery, namely, the prohibition of remarriage.

Thus the New York Revised Statutes until 1879 absolutely forbade the remarriage of the guilty party to a divorce during the lifetime of the innocent complainant, and the main judicial decision under the statute had declared null and void a marriage contracted outside of this State in order to evade the prohibition of our law. From this last decision, however, there lay a possible appeal, but so far as I am able to learn, the case was not carried up, and the question at issue had not been finally adjudicated by the Court of Appeals. There are not wanting persons who claim that the judgment in the case of *Marshall vs. Marshall*, to which we have referred, is not warranted by the law as it stands.

An able essay recently published (*Albany Law Journal*, June 18, 1880: 486–488) takes this ground. It maintains that the law of marriage is a part of international law, and that from its very nature marriage must have a legal ubiquity of operation. As in a civil contract the law of the place of contract prevails over the law of the domicile, so the validity of a marriage is to be decided by the law of the place where it is celebrated. If valid there, it is valid everywhere. This general rule can indeed be modified in Massachusetts. There the statute expressly declares null and void the remarriage of the guilty party to a divorce decreed in Massachusetts, even when this remarriage takes place outside of the State, and Chief Justice Gray admitted in one of his decisions that, but for this express prohibition of the statute, marriage contracted in evasion of the laws of that Commonwealth would not be invalid. But in the New York statute there is no express declaration that such marriages contracted *outside of the State* shall be null and void. Upon the principle, therefore, that penal laws can have no force outside of the territory which enacts them, and that the statute can apply to foreign marriages only in case of a special prohibition, which here is certainly not expressed, it is argued that the Courts of New York must recognize as valid even the remarriage of its own divorced citizens, provided this remarriage has been valid according to the law of the State in which it was contracted.

This principle of interpretation, if it were true, would settle the legitimacy of the marriage we are considering,— for it is beyond question that according to the law of Connecticut, where that marriage was contracted, the whole procedure was formally correct. How much of authority is there for this view? We have a decision of the Tennessee Supreme Court which is in point. The Tennessee law makes it a felony for any person to marry who has a former husband or wife living,— yet the Tennessee Court did not hold a woman, divorced in Kentucky and forbidden by Kentucky law to marry, to have violated any law when she evaded the Kentucky statute by marrying

in Tennessee (Bishop, 2 : 701); in other words, a person forbidden to marry in one State may lawfully marry in another.

In the case of *Ponsford vs. Johnson* (2 *Blatch.* 51), the United States Circuit Court asserted that a marriage contract would be valid, even if both parties should go into another State for the express purpose of evading the law of New York; and Judge Macomber, of the New York Supreme Court, has very recently decided, in the case of *Kerrison vs. Kerrison*, that the petitioner for the annulling of a marriage of this sort in another State could claim nothing of the Court, so long as she could not come with clean hands, that is, show that she was not herself a party to this evasion of the New York law (*Albany Law Journal*, Dec. 25, 1880 : 502). In denying the petition, Judge Macomber expressed himself as agreeing with the dissenting opinion of Judge Daniels in the Marshall case, that the validity of a marriage is to be determined solely by the law of the place where the marriage was contracted.

In his well-known work on *Marriage and Divorce*, Bishop, after citing the two cases first mentioned in this paragraph, sums up the whole matter in the following words :

"Thus it is held that, notwithstanding this statute, if a person divorced in New York goes into another State and there marries, the marriage is good in New York."

And in other places, with reference to the same matter, he declares that

"No New York statute should be construed to repeal or change international law." "It is a question whether all prohibitions of marriage to the divorced party should not be construed as operating merely by way of penalty, not as rendering the marriage void, unless express words of nullity are employed" (*Bishop*, 2 : 703).

We have now got before us whatever of argument and of authority has been thus far adduced in favor of the proposition that the New York Courts are compelled to recognize as valid those marriages which have been contracted in other States in defiance of their decrees. It is interesting to see that much of this argument was anticipated, and that at least an attempt was made to answer it, in the first and the chief case which has come before our Courts — the case of *Marshall vs. Marshall*, already twice alluded to. In his decision, Judge Westbrook replied to the assertion that, without express declarations of the statute that such foreign marriages were null and void, they must be held valid — replied by citing the celebrated case of *Brook vs. Brook* in the English House of Lords. Here an Englishman had gone to Denmark to marry his deceased wife's sister. Lord Chancellor Campbell pronounced the marriage null and void, although there was no special prohibition of foreign marriages of this sort in the English statute, and pronounced it null and void upon the ground that the law of the domicile followed the parties. Judge Daniels, in his dissenting opinion, attempted to offset Judge Westbrook's citation by remarking that Lord Chancellor Campbell was led to his conclusion by the fact that, according to English law, such marriage of a deceased wife's sister is an incestuous marriage, and so, opposed to the ecclesiastical policy of the kingdom. But, so far as appears, this consideration was not mentioned by the Lord Chancellor, and no intimation is given that the same rule of domicile would not apply to any other attempt to evade English law by marriage abroad.

Judge Westbrook's decision goes on to say that no other rule than that

which he enforces will enable a State to make its own laws of marriage and divorce effectual, and place that relation beyond the legislation of others. Story, in his *Conflict of Laws*, approves of this rule, and declares that, otherwise, "there is produced a state of anarchy and confusion upon the subject of this fundamental relation of society, whereby any State may be compelled to recognize the perfect validity and binding force of polygamous marriages." I may add to this statement of Story that to grant that marriage is to be judged solely by the law of the place of contract might conceivably compel the Courts of New York to recognize as lawfully married all the forty wives of Brigham Young, or the three thousand of the King of Dahomey. Incestuous and polygamous marriages must certainly be excepted from the operation of this rule. Is it not a serious question whether marriages contracted outside this State in fraud of our laws are not also to be excepted from its operation?

Since the cases which have been cited have none of them been carried up to the highest judicial tribunal, it becomes matter of great interest to know what view would probably be taken of them by the Court of Appeals. There are two official utterances of this Court which bear upon the present subject. Mr. Justice Johnson, by way of dictum, not of decision, has said of this statute prohibiting the remarriage of the guilty party to divorce (*Cropsey vs. Ogden*, 1 *Kernan*, 228, 235, 236):

"Its subject-matter is the prohibition of marriages within this State to certain persons who come within its terms. It covers the case of one married abroad and divorced abroad for his own adultery, just as plainly as it does the case of a marriage and divorce for the same cause here."

Again, in the case of *The People vs. Baker* (76 *N. Y.*, p. 78), in which the defendant had pleaded as a bar to his conviction for bigamy that a divorce had been decreed against him in Ohio for his own adultery, though at the time of the decree he was an actual resident of this State, our Court of highest resort, Mr. Justice Folger delivering the judgment, decided the New York Court could not allow the *status* of one of its own citizens to be determined by the laws or decisions of Ohio; in other words, the Ohio divorce might be valid in Ohio and as respects the party that resided there, but it could have no force in New York and as respects the party that resided here. The effect of this decision is the present incarceration in the Penitentiary of a man who, before his second marriage, and while residing here, had been divorced from his first wife in Ohio.

New York, in short, will not judge the *divorces* of its citizens by any other law than its own. But by the same rule, must not New York refuse to judge the *marriages* of its citizens by any other law than its own? Judge Folger does not say that marriages contracted outside this State in order to evade the prohibition of the New York statute, will be null and void, but it seems to me that this conclusion is implied in his reasoning. If the law of the domicile prevails in case of a *divorce* decreed against one of our citizens by the Court of another State, then the law of the domicile ought also to prevail in case of a *marriage* contracted by one of our citizens in another State; and, since New York is the domicile and New York law declares the marriage invalid, the Court of Appeals would, in consistency, seem compelled to decide that such marriage is null and void.

Although, as has been seen, I am inclined to regard this as the intent of the law, and although the tendency of the judicial decisions seems to me to be in this direction, there are many competent critics (as Bishop, 2 : 703), who deny that the law of domicile applies to marriage, even if it applies to divorce. For my own part, I must confess that the question whether such marriages are invalid is yet open to doubt — a doubt which has already led, and may still lead, to very unfortunate practical consequences. But whatever doubt may exist with regard to the nullity of such marriages, there can be no doubt as to one thing,— the guilty party to a divorce, who marries again, is a law-breaker, and though the Courts may possibly be compelled, according to our present law, to recognize his unlawful marriage as valid, yet he is under judicial ban, and may be made to suffer for his wrong doing.

It is to be feared, however, that in practice this suffering will be slight. It seems on the whole, probable that such transgressors will practically go unwhipped of justice. To marry again contrary to the express decree of the Court, provided it be done in some other State where the marriage of the guilty party to divorce is lawful, will, of course, not be recognized as bigamy by the New York Courts, at least where the divorce has been granted in this State. It is a violation of New York laws and a misdemeanor, but it is not bigamy. This Judge Folger declares, in the decision just alluded to. The reason is set forth in the case of *The People vs. Hovey* (5 *Barb.*, 117), and the reason is that divorce frees both parties. There cannot be a wife without a husband, nor a husband without a wife. If divorce makes both parties once more single, then neither party in marrying again can be called guilty of either bigamy, polygamy, or adultery, and therefore cannot be punished for any one of these crimes.

As a matter of fact there is no punishment, except in cases where the offender is compelled to ask for some relief from the Court whose decree he has violated, and on account of his contempt of court is refused. We have before us, indeed, the spectacle of a Judge of one of our metropolitan tribunals, who in defiance of a decree of the Courts, has contracted a foreign marriage, and who still, with soiled ermine, attempts to administer to others the justice which he himself has treated with derision. So far as pains and penalties are concerned, the prohibition of the Courts is only a *brutum fulmen*, "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing." And thus our society is taught contempt for law. Is it not evident that we need both a final judicial interpretation and a legislative modification of our present law, which shall on the one hand give it the definiteness of the law of Massachusetts, so that marriages contracted in evasion of our statutes shall be expressly declared null and void, and on the other hand shall ordain fixed pains and penalties for disobedience to our judicial decrees? *

---

* Since the above was written, decisions have been rendered by the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, as follows:—

October 4, 1881, in the case of *VanVoorhis vs. Brintnall* (86 *N. Y.*, p. 18), to the effect that prohibition of remarriage has no effect outside this State, and does not render invalid such remarriage. The child of such second marriage, born in this State, is legitimate.

December 28, 1882, in the case of *Thorp vs. Thorp* (90 *N. Y.*, p. 602), to the effect that marriage valid under the law of another State in which it was contracted is valid also in New York, even though it was contracted in disobedience of the prohibition of the

But what the law of the State, on account of its present defects, may not be able to punish, public opinion, and especially Christian sentiment, can punish and ought to punish. From the law of the State, therefore, I appeal to the law of Scripture.

It is a remarkable evidence of the profound view which the Hebrew nation had attained of the sanctity of the marriage relation, that the adulterer was not simply divorced,—the penalty was death. Such was the provision of the Mosaic law; and although the corruption of the Jewish people led to wide departures from the original idea of marriage as the union of one man and one woman, and divorce for trifling causes was permitted, we are to remember that this was "for the hardness of their hearts," and that "from the beginning it was not so."

Yet even during these days of obduracy there was a beneficent and disciplinary effect resulting from the Mosaic legislation. While the wife had no right of divorce, and might be put away for uncleanness, she could not be dismissed except by the writing and the delivery of a bill of divorcement. This was intended, as a late writer remarks, "to restrain a bad practice which had gone far to annul the original law of marriage, and which still prevails among the Arabs, who by a word may dissolve the marriage tie. To correct this custom, Moses allows a wife to be divorced only by a legal document, and forbids her husband to take her back after she has been married to another." As in those times the preparation of such a document was not the easiest or commonest of tasks, this provision of the law protected the wife, by giving time for the husband's anger to cool; while the permission accorded the woman to marry again, and the irrevocableness of the decision when once made, put serious hinderances in the way of sudden and unjust separations.

It is not, however, to the Mosaic law that I refer, when I speak of the Scriptural teaching with regard to marriage and divorce, but to the original

---

New York Court, and was contracted in that other State for the purpose of evading the New York law.

October 7, 1884, in the case of *Erkenbrach vs. Erkenbrach* (96 *N. Y.*, p. 456), to the effect that Courts in New York have no common law jurisdiction over the subject of divorce, their authority being confined altogether to the exercise of such express and incidental powers as are conferred by statute.

December 22, 1885, in the case of *O'Dea vs. O'Dea* (101 *N. Y.*, p. 23), to the effect that a husband, married in this State, deserted by his wife, and obtaining a divorce in Ohio, the marriage of the wife subsequently to another man in this State is declared to be void.

These decisions make it plain that the hope expressed when the above article was written has not been realized, and that one of our most respected Justices declares himself none too strongly, when, in a letter to the author, he speaks of these same decisions as illustrating "the wretched condition of the law in regard to the important relations to which they refer."

In the last case cited, the Court of Appeals has itself added a most significant comment. It is as follows: "In other States, judgments contrary to the authorities followed in this State have been rendered. This conflict of opinion, however much to be regretted, continues, and it yet remains for some ultimate authority to relieve the point from the difficulties now attending it, and determine the civil rights of parties whose relations, as legally defined by different State tribunals are liable to be regarded on one side of the State line as matrimonial, and on the other side as meretricious."

May we not add further, that national legislation seems the only remedy for this conflict of State laws, and that such legislation, if constitutional and practicable, would be a most worthy subject for debate and settlement by Congress?

law of the marriage relation, instituted at the Creation, to which Christ goes back, as to the ultimate norm and authority, and of which we have an exposition in his own words and in the words of his apostles. In this original institution of marriage there is an unmistakable intention to define it as the union of two, and of two only, so that they become, as it were, one being, and that for life. "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh."

When Christ comes to expound these words, it is plain that he regards the union as dissoluble only by death, or by that which, as respects the meaning and purpose of the relation, is the same as death. Let us take the fullest report of his teaching on the subject, in Matthew 19 : 9, by which we may fairly interpret the more condensed utterances in the other evangelists. "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery, and whoso marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery." Here it is plain that fornication — a general term implying an outward act wrought with a third person, a term, moreover, which includes adultery, interrupted or complete, or any of the unnameable and abominable vices — is, according to Christ's law, the sole valid ground of divorce.

It has been held by the Roman Catholic Church, otherwise so strict in matters of divorce, that the apostle Paul modifies Christ's teaching by allowing both divorce and second marriage to a Christian separated from a heathen partner by the agency of the latter, and many Protestants have drawn from this an apostolic justification of divorce in case of malicious desertion, whether the guilty party be heathen or not. In his admirable work on *Divorce and Divorce Legislation* (66, 71), President Woolsey has shown conclusively, as I think, on the one hand that Paul, like our Lord, started out, in his discussion, from the indissoluble nature of marriage, and admitted as the only exception that adultery which of itself caused the married pair no longer to be one flesh, and so violated the very idea of marriage. The only reason why Paul did not mention the exception is, as in the case of two of the evangelists, that he regarded the exception as a matter of course, and so passed it over in silence.

Dr. Woolsey has shown, on the other hand, that in 1 Cor. 7 : 15, as in the whole passage of which this verse forms a part, the apostle, in case of willful desertion of one partner by the other, permits separation but not remarriage. When he declares that in case the husband desert the wife, the latter "is not under bondage," he simply denies that the wife is bound at all hazards to continue living with the quarrelsome heathen husband. As in verse 10 he had said of the wife compelled to depart from her husband, "If she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband," so here, where the husband departs from the wife, the implication is that she is to remain unmarried also. Paul advances beyond Christ's position in only a single particular, namely, in conceiving of, and to a certain degree authorizing, separation without license of remarriage. The unwarrantable extension of Paul's principle so as to include all cases of desertion — we are still giving the substance of Dr. Woolsey's remarks — has opened a wide door of divorce in Christian countries.

Let all Christians understand that what Paul permits in cases of deser-

tion is simply separation *a mensa et thoro*, without a separation *a vinculo matrimonii*,—in other words, separation from bed and board, but not absolute divorce with the right of remarriage. "This third state, midway between full marriage union and divorce, has the sanction of the apostle Paul, and may be introduced into the law of Christian lands." Whatever legislation gives greater license than this, is false in principle, and opens the way for all manner of immorality. For I can only repeat the words of Christ -- words whose reasonableness and truth are only made more clear by the pernicious results of recent experiments in law-making in the various States of the Union: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery, and whoso marrieth her which is put away, committeth adultery." "And if a woman shall put away her husband and be married to another, she committeth adultery." (Mat. 19 : 9; Mark 10 : 12.)

We come once more to the case which we set out to examine. What is the law of Christ with regard to the remarriage of persons who have been absolutely divorced, and divorced upon Scriptural grounds? We may answer at once, that the remarriage of the innocent party is permitted. Our Saviour's words imply this when he declares that, in every other case but this one of divorce for adultery, remarriage is unlawful. Such divorce just as completely frees the woman as does the husband's death, in which last case, as Paul tells us, she is free from the law of her husband, "so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man" (Rom. 7 : 3).

But may the guilty party marry again? We can only reply that Christ says nothing about the guilty party, and therefore our conclusions with regard to him must be mainly inferential and conjectural. We are not on this account, however, wholly without light upon the question. It was not so necessary that our Lord should treat of the rights of the guilty party to divorce, for the Mosaic law was there as the constant presupposition of his precepts—a law which he did not come to destroy, but to fullfil. According to that law, the guilty party to a divorce had no rights, unless it were the right to suffer death as the penalty of adultery. The case of the woman taken in adultery, even if we regard it as belonging to the sacred narrative, is no proof that Christ abrogated that penalty, for it was not solemn judicial process that he discountenanced, but the mob-violence of Pharisees, when he said, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her!" Nor does the fact that the power of life and death had been taken from the Jews by their Roman masters show that adultery was uniformly allowed to go unpunished. There were theocratic penalties, such as excommunication from the synagogue, which to a Jew had almost the bitterness of death.

Is it possible to conceive that Jesus, with the Mosaic abhorrence of adultery and the remembrance of the Mosaic command that both parties to it should be stoned with stones till they died—is it possible to conceive, I say, that Jesus could have had it for his intent to let the adulterer go unscathed, to repeat his crime, to corrupt others, and even to consummate a new marriage for the very sake of which his adultery may have been planned? The supposition seems incredible. If there be any crime against society upon which civil law needs to lay its hand, it would seem to be that crime which, in its very nature, tends to destroy the family, and turns the

nursery of the child into a haunt of defilement and shame. And can there be any penalty for this great crime so obviously just, as to prohibit those who have been recreant to their trust from entering again upon a relation to which they have been so false? It seems, therefore, most untrue to say that Christ's silence is to be interpreted as granting permission to the guilty party to divorce to marry again.

Here I am happy to have the strong support of President Woolsey's work on Divorce, to which I have already referred. I quote from him once more (page 60):

"It has been gravely argued in our country and our time that, inasmuch as the married pair are no longer one flesh after crime, the guilty one is free to marry again, yes, even to marry the tempter or seducer, and that this is no violation of the law of Christ. We admit that Christ observes silence on this point. He could not say that such a guilty author of a divorce committed adultery by marrying again, for she is now free from her husband. But it would have been idle to refer to such a case, for in the first place it had nothing to do with the immediate point on which Christ expresses an opinion, and in the second place such a person would have been punishable by the Jewish law with death. To claim for an adulterer and an adulteress the protection of law in a Christian State, so that, when free through their crime from former obligations, they may legally perpetuate a union begun in sin, is truly to put a premium upon adultery. A Herod, on that plan, after sinning with his brother's wife, would need only to wait for legal separation to convert incest into legitimate wedlock."*

It is by this time sufficiently plain that I consider the guilty party to a divorce, who marries again, at least during the life of the former partner, as virtually becoming a breaker of the law of Scripture as well as of the law of the State. Penitence, however, is possible, and good works may follow upon wrong-doing. Separation from the new partner, even after the State has declared the marriage null and void, may be, after years have passed, a greater wrong to the family than the continuance of the relation would be. After evidence of genuine contrition, the church may possibly receive such a person into its number, and may be benefited in many respects by his influence.

But what shall we say, when one who has passed through this sad experience feels himself called to the ministry, and asks for ordination? In the view of some, the same rule that would bar him from the ministry would bar him from the church. But we are persuaded that those who reason thus are in error. It is clear from the epistles of the New Testament, that there were special qualifications required in those who were to be teachers and leaders of the flock, which were not demanded of others. The man who is to stand before Christians as an example and an instructor must be "blameless," by which we understand free, since his professed conversion, from any such moral delinquency as would generate suspicion with regard to the reality of his Christian character, and so would hinder his proper influence.

There are able interpreters who would give the term "blameless" a wider comprehension still, making it include the life before, as well as after, conversion, and they point to the very striking fact, that in the New Testament there is no instance where the hands of Paul, or of the other apostles, were

* In a private note to the author of this essay, received since the above was written, President Woolsey intimates that, since his book on Divorce was published, he has so far changed his view as to hold that no prohibition of such remarriage can fairly be drawn from Christ's own words, although he holds it to be contrary to good morals for either civil law or church law to permit remarriage in these cases.

laid in ordination upon the head of any man who had led an openly immoral life. I hesitate, however, to press an argument from the silence of Scripture, and there may be doubt with regard to a rule which would have cost the church the ministerial service of an Augustine. But when a man's earlier sin shows its traces still in his present spirit and conduct, it is impossible to disconnect the two parts of his history in judging of his fitness for the ministry. In the case we are considering, this seems to be the fact. The evasion of New York law by marrying in another State, the doing of an act in Connecticut for the sake of escaping a punishment which would have been visited had the act been done in the place of his domicile, indicates a lingering of the same disregard for law which was manifest in the original adultery, and compels us to judge the last offense in the light of the former.

And what we are compelled to do, the whole community in which such a man should do his ministerial work, would also be compelled to do. They have before them, as preacher of God's law, a man who has successfully defied those "powers that be" which are "ordained of God." His example will speak louder than his precepts. It will nullify his preaching. And therefore he ought not to be a minister of the gospel. "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord," was the demand of the priests of the Old Testament. "Having a good report of them that are without," is the demand of the ministers of the New. Such a man as we have supposed is not "blameless," and there is no place for him in the Christian ministry.

In the excellent little treatise of Dr. Hovey, entitled *The Scriptural Law of Divorce* (pages 61–70), I find drawn out in full an argument which I had intended to present in detail, but which, with this reference, I must content myself with simply mentioning. In the letters of the apostle Paul to Timothy and Titus, he enjoins that the bishop, presbyter, pastor, be "the husband of one wife,"— that is, as nearly all agree, husband of no more than one wife. It is evident that the injunction takes for granted that there were in the church those who were husbands of more than one wife; for if this were not so, this distinguishing requisition of pastors would be meaningless.

Now it cannot be supposed for a moment that actual polygamists were included among the number of the members of Christ's church. The only reasonable inference is, that Paul alludes to the many converted from among the heathen, who, in their unregenerate days, yielding to the loose divorce practices of their time — practices which the Romans had apparently introduced into Palestine as well as into Greece — had married different wives at different times, divorcing one that they might take another, and so had come to have two or more persons still living to whom they had sustained the relation of husband. The danger arising from such facts as these, and the evidence these facts gave of an unstable and sensual mind, were a sufficient reason, in the judgment of the apostle, why such persons should not be entrusted with the responsibilities of government and leadership in the church of God.

Do I need to apply these remarks, or to sum up what I have said? I consider that no person who has been a willful contemner of the laws of the State in which he lives, and who is now enjoying the fruits of this contempt, is a proper candidate for ordination to the Christian ministry. I have grave doubts whether a confessed adulterer, who since his connection with the

church has by stratagem escaped the legal penalty of his crime, is a proper person to be ordained by an ecclesiastical council. I deny that a man who knows of two living persons whom he has called his wife, can answer to Paul's requisitions of the Christian bishop. And it seems certain to me that no person of whom all these things are true can, by any gifts or graces, make up for the lack of that "blamelessness" and "good report" which the New Testament requires of its ministers.

The matter which we have thus discussed is one of grave concern, when we remember how rife in our day is the theory that marriage is merely a civil contract, and that, like other civil contracts, it may be dissolved at the will of the parties to it. But marriage, like the State, is more than a civil contract,—it is an ordinance of God. Though entered into of free will, the relation, once formed, is clothed with divine sanctions and obligations, and is nothing less than the merging of the life of the one contracting party in the life of the other. The view that marriage is a partnership, to be dissolved for slight causes, if not at will, is one which in practice would destroy the very foundation of civilized society. The civil-contract theory of marriage has in it the germ of far greater disaster than has the social-compact theory of government. Stringent divorce laws in protecting marriage protect the State, for the purity of family life is the chief safeguard of social morality and of public justice. Contempt of these laws is a heinous offense against God and man.

Marriage is not a sacrament, as the Romanist declares it to be, nor in case of adultery is it indissoluble. But it is indissoluble for every other cause; and, when dissolved for this reason, it should be with penalties visited upon the offender such as will vindicate God's law and the law of the State. While we do not hold it a sacrament, we may hold it sacred. And this we are bound to do, as ministers, by solemnizing no marriages between persons unlawfully divorced; as members of ordaining councils, by refusing to admit to the sacred office offenders against Christ's law and the civil statute; as members of churches, by subjecting to discipline those who violate the Scriptural rule of marriage and divorce; as citizens, by holding up the teaching of Christ as the model of human legislation, and by influencing the makers of our laws to conform their work more perfectly to the divine standard. If there is anything of the Protestant spirit left in us, it is time for us to protest against the incoming flood of immorality which takes the guise of divorce law in so many of our States, and under the leadership of the Spirit to lift up a standard against it.

XLIV.

CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY.*

On the first day of January, 1827, Thomas Chalmers made this entry in his journal :—"My chief earthly ambition is to finish a treatise on Political Economy as the commencement of a series of future publications on Moral Philosophy and Theology. Consecrate this ambition, and purge it of all sin and selfishness, O God!" And Dr. Chalmers closed his published work on "Political Economy, in connection with the Moral Aspects of Society" by earnestly recommending the lessons of this science to all who enter upon what he was pleased to call "the ecclesiastical profession." In all this, however, he was only acting upon the hint furnished him by Adam Smith, father of the whole race of modern investigators in Social Science, for Adam Smith more than a hundred years ago, taught Political Economy from the chair of Moral Philosophy at Glasgow. Such examples as these made it possible for Archbishop Whately to say that "no Theological Seminary should be without its Professorship of Political Economy," and for Dr. Bethune to call Political Economy "that philosophic science which next to the gospel, whose legitimate offspring it is, will do more than anything else for the elevation and fraternization of our race."

I mention these great names as a partial justification of the unusual theme which I discuss to-night, namely, the Relations between Christianity and Political Economy If any doubts still exist as to the reality of these relations, I am confident that a glance at the nature and province of Political Economy and Christianity respectively, will convince us of the intimate connection between the two. Political Economy is not, as some would have us believe, the science of mere material values or exchanges. No writer has ever yet been able to exclude from his account of it either moral influences or moral products. We cannot build it up unless we combine with the facts of outward nature other truths relating to human nature. No less broad a definition can embrace the matters discussed in the text books, than that propounded by Storch, the Russian economist, when he tells us that Political Economy is the science of the natural laws which determine the prosperity of nations, including not only their wealth but their civilization.

That there is such a science as this, we must maintain in spite of Mr. De Quincey's seeming denial. When he asserted that in Political Economy "nothing can be postulated, nothing demonstrated, for anarchy even as to its earliest principles is predominant," he undoubtedly exaggerated the defective condition of economic knowledge in his day. John Stuart Mill, indeed, had not then published his great work, and the Reformers had not

* A Lecture before the Pennsylvania Ministers' Institute, Chester, Pa., June, 1871.

yet sufficient strength to secure the repeal of the Corn Laws. But to say that Political Economy was not even then a science, is to forget Adam Smith. The analogy of history, of geology, of morals, should have taught De Quincey better. All these are sciences, although in each of them many a dispute is still unsettled. In each of them there is a body of principles arranged and classified. And it is true in our day, if not in De Quincey's, that there is a general settling down upon certain principles of Political Economy, as not only abstractly true but as practically verified. The great battles of the science have been fought out in England, and fought out for all time.

The day has gone by, moreover, when it could be even plausibly maintained that each country must have its own Political Economy, and that what is true in England is not true in America. Those who hold this opinion assuredly fail to magnify their office as economists, for such views reduce Political Economy from a science to an art. It cannot be thus reduced, because it has its foundations in the immutable laws of man's intellectual and social being. While humanity remains the same, the principles upon which man acts in securing his physical and social welfare will not change. These principles may be ignored and denied, but results will justify them. Since the laws of nature and the laws of mind are everywhere the same, there must be one Political Economy, as there is one Astronomy and one Moral Philosophy, for England and for India, for America and for Japan.

The fundamental law of mind with which Political Economy has to deal is the law of self-interest. Finding this principle of action implanted in the human constitution and serving as the great motor in human intercourse, the science seeks to determine the methods and results of its operation,— in other words, the physical and social laws which coöperate with it, and the effect upon the individual and upon society of hindering and counteracting its working on the one hand, or of allowing it the freest play and development on the other.

With the morals of self-interest, Political Economy, it is true, does not concern itself. And yet no one can for a moment doubt that there is such a thing as the morals of self-interest. Moral Philosophy, as Dugald Stewart assures us, must recognize self-love not as an instinctive but as a rational principle, and must fix its place not simply among the desires but among the duties. For this reason, Political Economy is as intimately allied to Moral Philosophy as it is to purely physical science, and we can say with Dr. Wayland : "The principles of Political Economy are so closely analogous to those of Moral Philosophy, that almost every question of the one may be argued on grounds belonging to the other."

And here we see how, in the very nature of the innermost principle of each, there is ground for suspecting a connection between Political Economy and Christianity. For, as the fundamental law of the former is self-interest, so that of the latter is universal benevolence. Love and self-love — are they necessarily antagonistic to each other? Because a man loves his neighbor, must he cease to love himself? Or, does he secure his own interest best, when he cherishes affection and practices benevolence toward all? These questions at least suggest to us that there may be an important and interesting relation and coöperation between principles of our nature that at first sight seem so diverse in their tendencies. Instead of warring against each other,

they may be like the centrifugal and centripetal forces which result in the safe and harmonious movement of the earth in the line of progress marked out for it by God.

But we may go further than this. Any true view of the nature of Christianity leads us to suspect a relation between it and Political Economy far higher and more vital than that of reconciled antagonism. For there is such a thing as Christianity in the concrete, as well as Christianity in the abstract. Christianity is salvation for the body and for society, as well as salvation for the individual and for the soul. More and more it is perceived that Christianity, instead of contravening natural law, is in complete accord with natural law. In the highest and best sense, Christianity is the religion of nature — of nature true and perfect as it exists in the mind of God. As Theology becomes imbued with the realistic spirit of this new and better age, it traces more clearly the analogy between natural and moral law, applies more thoroughly to Christian thought the idea of law which is the inspiration of modern science, represents Christianity more consistently as "the royal law" of which all Mosaic laws were the half-developed and half-comprehended germ, and of which the physical and social laws of God's universe are but partial types and illustrations. With every stride of the world's thought, it is becoming more plain that religion and morality are essentially one; that faith and works are inseparable; and that a true Christianity involves the highest physical and social, as well as the highest mental and moral, well-being of man.

I know of no better proof of the divine origin of Christianity than this, that her laws are little by little found to be laws of nature. And no consummation can be more important or fruitful in blessing than the determination of the place of the sciences in the conquering train of Christ. It is no small gain to religion and to human welfare, when any single department of knowledge confesses an humble relationship to Christianity and begins to serve its progress. This I believe to be already true of Political Economy. She has been more deeply indebted to Christianity, in the past, than she has sometimes been willing to admit. Just as inventions like that of achromatic lenses, to which men seemed to be led by theoretical study alone, have been found to be anticipated in the wonderful natural adjustments and adaptations of the human eye, so philosophers and statesmen have not seldom been forced to accept broad and liberal theories of man's commercial and industrial relations, and after they have accepted them, have found to their surprise that these theories were essentially Christian theories, a legitimate outgrowth of principles which Christianity had inculcated long before. If Christianity has not furnished the germs of such theories, she has at least been the main agent in stimulating inquiry into the social welfare of mankind — an inquiry almost unknown in ante-Christian times, — and has often furnished the moral power to carry out true theories, when selfishness has planted itself like a battery in the way. And Political Economy has partially repaid the debt, by furnishing concrete illustrations of Christ's laws, and by preparing the way for his triumphs.

The need of determining the relations between these two great departments of human thought, and of adjusting them to each other, appears more clearly when we once consider the grievous results of even a partial and temporary

war between them. We all know the harm that comes to thinking minds from the false impression that Social Science teaches the supreme and rightful sway of other laws than those revealed in the gospel,— we all know how vast a multitude of the world's workers scout religion because it asserts a natural inequality of gifts and station, and for this reason put some wild theory of human rights in place of it. For the sake of men's souls then, as well as for the sake of their temporal welfare, we need to show them the folly of putting Christianity and Social Science in antagonism to each other, or of fancying that the truths of the one contradict the truths of the other. Mineralogists tell us that there is a crystal called tourmaline, that has a peculiar power of polarizing or twisting the rays of light that pass through it. Let a second crystal of tourmaline be added to the first in a transverse direction, and though each taken singly is transparent, every ray of light is stopped in the passage through the two, so that to use the words of a noted chemist, "the rays of the meridian sun cannot pass through a pair of crossed tourmalines"— the two crystals shut out the rays as perfectly as the closed slats of your window blinds shut out the sun. Turn the tourmalines in the same direction, and they are transparent to the light,— cross them, and not a ray of light can pass through them. I have sometimes fancied that Political Economy and Christianity were like these tourmalines. Either taken separately will give you the light of truth, God's light from heaven,— but when you have them both together, you must adjust them to each other, or they will refuse to transmit the light at all ; set them in antagonism to each other, and the very light that is in them becomes darkness.

We have great reason to believe, then, that the relation between Christianity and the science we are considering is not so much a relation of reconciled antagonism, as it is one of preëstablished harmony and coöperation. Both are parts of one great system. We shall see this more clearly if we look at certain elements in each which, if not identical with, are at least strikingly analogous to, corresponding elements of the other. First, there is a *human* element in Political Economy as well as in Christianity,— the supreme rank of manhood is recognized in the one as well as in the other. Political Economy teaches that the chief agent in production, and the chief author of wealth, is human labor. Mere natural gifts do not constitute wealth,— they furnish utilities but not values. Air and sunshine, though very useful, will bring no price, because they are God's free gifts, and gifts to all alike. There are certain anomalous cases of value, which at first sight seem difficult to bring under this principle, but they are only apparent exceptions to the rule. The diamond, which I find by accident upon the sea shore, has as great value as if I had obtained it with infinite toil by searching the river beds of Brazil. The value certainly does not lie in the material itself,— this never costs, but whenever it *is* given, is always *freely* given by God,— but the value does just as certainly, though only partially, originate in the labor which went to the picking up and appropriation of the stone. Left there upon the shore, unseen and unappropriated, the diamond would be as worthless as any common pebble.

There is indeed another element in value, soon to be mentioned, besides this of human labor. Yet still there is substantial truth in Hobbes's maxim, that "plenty dependeth, next to God's favor, on the labor and industry of

man." And the truth was never more clearly stated than in the first great text-book of political economy: "Labor was the first price, the original purchase-money, that was paid for all things. It was not by gold or by silver, but by labor, that all the wealth of the world was originally purchased." Labor gives worth to all things we possess. Labor is the alchemist that turns the barren sand to gold. Labor not only originates, but it from year to year reproduces, the wealth of a country. Capital is being forever consumed, and as it is consumed it must be renewed by labor. The old computations of physiology made out that the particles of matter in our bodies changed once in seven years, so that not an ounce of our weight was the same that it was seven years before. Modern investigations have greatly shortened the period, but it furnishes still an apt illustration of the way in which labor is perpetually renewing the wealth of the land. The whole capital of this country is only seven times as great as its annual production. Sweep away all the wealth of the nation,—a few years labor would produce as much again. From this fact Mr. Mill explains the surprising rapidity with which countries devastated by war recover themselves. The war only consumes, a little earlier, what would have been consumed sooner or later at any rate; a few years of increased exertion make it all up again.

So we see the necessity and dignity of labor. Political Economy is far from being the materialistic science of which it has often been accused. It declares that wealth consists, not in material products, but in the manly energy that has been expended upon them. It assures us that the strength of a nation is not in its treasures of gold and silver, its fertile soil, its capacious harbors, its overflowing granaries, its splendid edifices, its parks for pleasure, but in the honest toil, the intelligent industry, the mental capacity, the moral energy of its sons.

> "What constitutes a state?
> Not high raised battlement or labored mound,
> Thick wall or moated gate;
> Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned;
> Not bays and armed ports,
> Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
> Not starred and spangled courts,
> Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride;
> No, men — high-minded men —
> * * * * * * * * * *
> Men who their duties know,
> But know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain."

Sir William Jones was right. Political Economy joins hands with Christianity in making man king of this lower world. When it declares that no earthly thing has value, except it bear man's seal and superscription upon it, it proclaims the self-same truth that Christianity had uttered from the first, —namely, the dignity of manhood, and the essential grandeur of all faithful human work.

Let us appreciate, before we go further, the significance and worth of this united testimony. Let us remember that this truth, so familiar to us and so vital to human welfare, is by no means a universal or intuitive idea. Men have not always believed it. The greatest masters of ancient thought, Plato and Aristotle, denied it. Aristotle asserted that a mechanical employment was ignoble and destructive to virtue, while Plato excluded husbandmen and

artizans from all share in his ideal government. Even Cicero said that all artizans were engaged in a degrading profession, and that there could be nothing ingenuous in a workshop. But now Social Science accepts the teaching of Christianity that labor is not merely the appointed lot of man, but that it is the chief source of human wealth ; that the highest end of humanity is not mere production, but rather the development of manhood ; that man in other words is the centre and glory of the world ; that persons are greater than things ; that humanity is worthy of universal honor. We may *use* natural agents, air, water, fire, soil ; but we may never *use* man,— treat him as a brute thing, forget the dignity of his being or the nobility of his labor. The Scripture only anticipates the voice of Science, when it declares:—

> "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels,
> And hast crowned him with glory and honor.
> Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands;
> Thou hast put all things under his feet."

Secondly, there is a *social* element in Political Economy, as well as in Christianity. While both recognize the importance of human labor and the dignity of the human person, they also recognize the mutual needs and dependence of men. Every man has a multitude of desires, but he has the power to satisfy very few of these desires by his own labor. How many of the articles you consume do you actually produce yourself? Exceedingly few. You may make one or two things well, but you cannot make all things well. Humanity would go back to the savage state, if it were not for division of labor, and exchange of products one for another. Thus we come at once to the provision in the very constitution of man for his social existence, and civilization might be defined as an organized recognition of this mutual dependence. From this dependence arises one of the most important ideas of Political Economy — an idea first clearly announced by Bastiat, the French Economist — namely, the idea of *service*. This supplements the idea of labor which we have just been considering, and, together with that, makes up the full and correct notion of value. Value has its source not in labor alone, but in labor so applied and directed that it constitutes a service to somebody else. Service in this way becomes the real measure of value. Things are valuable, according as they are capable of ministering to other's good.

See then the network, in one sense simple, yet in another infinitely intricate and ingenious, which binds me, whether I will or no, to my neighbor, and makes it necessary that I should maintain relations with him, and in some way serve him. My isolated and selfish notions of value are of very little importance ; it takes two to make a bargain ; I must consult my neighbor's opinion as well as my own. I may own a gold mine in the middle of Africa, or a whole square league of ground on Hudson's Bay, and be none the richer for it. I may labor all my days, but so long as all my efforts are spent upon myself, I have accomplished nothing toward the production of value. Political Economy rates me only as an unproductive consumer of God's bounty, until I leave my selfishness and isolation, and begin by the work of my brain or of my hands to serve my fellow-men.

We have seen that labor is not dishonorable,— let us learn the equally important lesson that service is no more so. Whether we call it by that name or not, every man who prospers in any honest trade or profession does so by

virtue of the service he renders others. To wash clothes or to black boots for a livelihood, provided it be only a willing and hearty service, is a calling as respectable as that of the lawyer or the preacher. It is the very dignity of the preacher that he is a "minister," or as the word implies, a servant. And a just Political Economy only echoes the maxims of Christianity :— "He that will be chief among you let him be your minister;" "no man liveth unto himself;" "by love serve one another." And this not simply by furthering their temporal good. It is the greatest of mistakes to suppose that Social Science recognizes no values but those which are material. In Dr. Hanna's biography of his great father-in-law, we have an amusing instance of the *reductio ad absurdum* applied to such a theory as this. "Most of Dr. Chalmers' students," runs the biography, "will recall his triumphant overthrow of Adam Smith's unfortunate distinction between productive and unproductive labor, in which the statesman, the judge, the lawyer, the teacher, the clergyman and the man of science, are all classed among the non-producers, the *nati consumere fruges*, because they do not create any tangible commodity: while the pastry-cook, the squib-manufacturer, and the vender of quack medicines are exalted to the rank of productive laborers because they create tangible commodities." But Dr. Chalmers might have made his point clearer, if he had more fully apprehended the nature of value as consisting essentially in service. Then he might have seen that Political Economy not only recognizes other commodities than those which are merely material, but that it directly tends to elevate all labor by the supreme value it puts upon the mental and moral qualities which enter into it. The same exertion of nerve and muscle that carries the savage in his foot-race may carry the physician on his errand of mercy. The same voice that sings the ribald song may come to preach the everlasting gospel. Thus by turning labor into service, and by estimating its value according to the higher elements which go to the making of it, Political Economy unites with Christianity in teaching that an isolated, selfish life is worthless, but that the service of mankind is the end for which we are to live.

But a third principle comes into view here, and completes the circle. The personal and social elements in both Political Economy and Christianity *harmonize* with each other. The service of others is perfectly compatible with our own best and highest interest. Every one knows the lamentable consequences of the old Mercantile Theory, which in effect said to individuals and classes and nations: "Get money — honestly if you can, — but get money." It made the great end of life to sell — and to sell for coin, — as if coin were of value except for what it would buy. It went deliberately upon the principle that, in every bargain, one party must always get the better of the other; that for every gain there must be somewhere a corresponding loss. And so there was, under the forms of peace, a real war between individuals, and between classes, and between nations. Each felt that the rest were crowding him, and that he could secure his own interest only by crowding them. Governments interfered to prevent injustice, but, by imposing burdens upon trade and commerce, only added to the injustice they sought to remove. There cannot be found a more striking instance of the practical disorganization and misery that may result from a false theory of human relations. But, although we still see relics of this ancient absurdity in pop-

ular theories of class-legislation and of foreign trade, we congratulate ourselves that the hideous spectre appears very little of late in scientific literature. The whole doctrine of Exchange, the central doctrine of Political Economy, is based upon the idea that every bargain may be, and should be, of mutual advantage to both parties. And since men form a clearer idea of their own interest than any other man or body of men can form for them, the State can better serve them and serve itself by leaving each to follow his own bent, make his own bargains, engage in his own trade, whatever these may be. In other words, the prosperity of the public is identical with the prosperity of individuals, and the prosperity of one class of the community identical with the prosperity of every other.

I cannot raise my own wheat or grind my own flour. It is an advantage to me to pay the flour-dealer for my flour, even though I give a price sufficient to compensate him for his time and skill in selection, besides remunerating the farmer who raised the wheat, the miller who ground it, and the transportation company who brought it to market. All these make their profit, but that does not prevent me from making my profit from the bargain also. And no trade or business in which this principle of mutual advantage does not apply is any more expedient in economics, than it is legitimate in morals. To sell adulterated liquors is an injury to public wealth as well as to public virtue, because no real service is rendered for the money received. To grind the faces of the poor, by extortion and usury, injures trade everywhere by violating the law of reciprocal benefit which lies at the basis of it. A spirit of grasping selfishness is destructive of my own permanent interest. It is for my interest to encourage others to bring me the best of their products, and to do this with regularity and constancy. They cannot do this without fair remuneration. So that I must not only live, but let live. I must act on the principle that what harms others really does indirectly harm me. And what is this, but the Scripture exhortation: "Look not every man upon his own things but also upon the things of others." Political Economy, as well as Christianity, commands us not to drive too sharp bargains; not to depreciate another's work; not to think that any one class can monopolize the profits of trade, without indirectly harming itself thereby. Since many sorts of men, many classes of producers, must live together, it is for their interest not to live in conflict, but to remember that their interest and others' good are inseparable. Love works no ill to my neighbor,—neither does it work ill to me. In the last analysis, self-love and Christian love teach the same lesson. There is a benevolence inherent in all just Economy. It is the sworn and constant foe to all slavery, to all monopoly, to all prejudices and hatreds, whether of class or race. Social Science as well as Christianity urges me to give labor its freedom, its honor, its reward. When I "render unto all their dues," and "love my neighbor as myself," I only secure my own interest, for the good of each is bound up in the good of all.

Thus it is that Christianity and Political Economy not only recognize and justify the fundamental principles of each other, but confess that the principles of the one are essentially the same with those of the other, the difference between them resulting mainly from the different points of view from which each regards the facts common to both, and from the different spheres in which religion and science move. On the one hand, Christianity concedes

a place and a large place to self-love,—this indeed is made the measure of the love due to our neighbor. On the other hand, Political Economy allows that the truest self-love is impossible without benevolent regard for the interests and rights of others. And so, with a little change of phrase, we can repeat the words of a noted writer on Social Science: "The rules of Christian morality are so far coincident with those of utility that, long periods and entire communities being contemplated, their precepts are the same."

The value of such a conclusion as this can hardly be overestimated. Let me illustrate it. Many of you are aware that there once were many, and still are a few, who deny the vegetable nature and origin of coal. The solid and brittle blocks we put upon our fires certainly look far more like mineral than like woody matter. Theoretically convinced as I had always been that these blocks were the relics of ancient forests, I had often longed for some ocular demonstration of the fact. So I made myself familiar with the look of different woods under the microscope, and especially with that of the coniferous woods, of which the coal was said to be composed. A simple pine-shaving presented a beautiful and striking spectacle. There were the multitude of elongated cells stretching often across the whole field of view,—each cell with those characteristic internal markings which to a practiced eye reveal the nature of the wood, as plainly as the leaf and bark and contour of the stately pine reveal the nature of the tree to the lumberman in the forest. Upon the side of each cell, though so minute as to be utterly invisible to the naked eye, were delicate rows of sculptured circles, each with its central dot, as if some fairy had been working at it with tiny compasses. And then across these tubular cells, piled one upon another, were seen at intervals certain darker groups of perpendicular bars, arranged like short horizontal ladders. These were the medullary rays, which serve perhaps with their infinitesimal fibres to bind the cells together. Such was the appearance of the pine-wood shaving. But this was not enough. I obtained also a section of cannel coal. It had been fastened securely to a strip of glass, and then ground down so thin as to be nearly transparent. I put this under the microscope too,—and lo! there were the same elongated cells, piled one upon another,—there were the evident traces of circular markings upon their sides, —there were the ladder-like groups of medullary rays,—and all as unmistakable as they had been in the little pine-shaving I had seen before. If I had had doubts before, I could doubt no longer; the pines of to-day had their representatives ages upon ages ago. Unlike as they seemed at first, the coal and the wood were essentially one. So there is a minute scrutiny of the facts of Social Science that finds therein the proofs of its essential oneness with Christian truth. The hard, dark, dead mass of economic laws assumes new beauty and significance when we see in them representatives of the same life that inspires the gospel, and find that the truths of the one corroborate and illustrate the truths of the other.

It would be matter of great interest to apply the principles I have enunciated to one after another of the practical relations discussed in social economics, and to verify them in each. Time, however, and the patience of my auditors, will prevent our glancing at more than a single one. Let us look for a few moments at the relation between capital and labor. I draw your attention to this, because the questions at issue here are among

the most important and pressing with which the nation and the church have at present to do. There can be no doubt that the thought of the world has been turning of late from political to social questions, and that the greatest secular movement of modern society is that which seeks to rescue the workman from the grasp and control of capital. With the rising intelligence of the laboring classes, there is a rising fear of the ultimate effects upon them of the enormous aggregations of wealth which modern division of labor and costly machinery seem to require in all sorts of production. The danger which seems imminent to many thoughtful minds among them, is the danger that capital may soon secure such a monopoly of production, that all possibility of competition will cease, and that with this will be wrested from the real workers of the world all hope of rising above the rank in which they were born. To be a proletarian class, dependent for their very breath upon the favor of capitalists, and bitterly conscious that their masters may combine to crush out of them all independence and all hope,— this is the picture which they draw to themselves of the not improbable future, provided they do not bestir themselves to secure their rights. And we cannot wonder that they love quite as little the tyranny of gigantic corporations, as they do the tyranny of feudal lords from which they have just escaped. France cares more to-day about a reorganization of society with reference to the labor-question, than she does about monarchy or democracy. The Communists of Paris, abolishing rents as they did, and demanding the use of capital without interest, were strong because they represented the popular sentiment of the metropolis with regard to the so-called rights of labor. And their English sympathizers in Hyde Park, only awhile ago, showed their view of the relation between capital and labor, by the declaration of one of their speakers that the accumulation of property was robbery, and that those who accumulated it were not only thieves but murderers.

Not all laborers, thanks to the intelligence and freedom of America, are in such gross darkness as prevails in some parts of Europe. Yet there are frequent indications of radically wrong thinking upon this subject, even on this side of the Atlantic — wrong thinking which, if not replaced by a better sentiment may, sooner than we suppose, breed public trouble. It is of vast importance to our future peace, that pulpit and press alike should inculcate sound doctrine with regard to the relations of Capital and Labor. Let the voice of Christianity, as well as the voice of Economic Science, be heard, vindicating the principles which we have seen to belong to both. Let them declare the mutual dependence and common interest of employer and employed. On the one hand, let them demand for the laborer a fair share in the products of his toil. The journeyman-mechanic's work is just as important in its place as that of the capitalist who employs him. Capital is dependent upon labor, and should recognize this dependence. But then, on the other hand, let them demand for the capitalist, his fair share also. Labor may exaggerate its claims. It may become as arbitrary and irresponsible a tyrant as capital ever was. It may make out that it is the only agent in production, and demand all the fruits, thus violating the rule of Scripture and of Political Economy alike. It is of as much importance that the workman should understand the nature and rights of capital, as that the capitalist should understand the nature and rights of labor.

Labor and capital,— they go together; both are essential, and equally essential, to production. As well dispute which blade of a pair of scissors has most to do with the cutting, as to dispute whether labor has most to do with production, and deserves the greatest reward, or whether capital does most and deserves most. Future production would be impossible, were it not for the capital that in the meantime supports labor. Capital is nothing but the accumulations of the past, applied as a fund for new production. Hence it is the very store from which the laborer draws his life. Capital does not lie idle,— the moment it lies idle it really ceases to be capital,— but is all consumed in employing and sustaining labor for the harvests of the future. Even the capitalist who does no work himself gets interest for the *use* of his money. How could he get interest for it, if his money were not put to *use* — were not doing useful work in the hands of somebody — were not providing wages for laborers whom the capitalist never saw? Thus capital is the limit of industry; when capital gives out, industry must starve. Hence, nothing is so much to be desired by the laborer as that capital should be abundant, and that its possession should be safe,— for in this case competition among capitalists will be most active, and the wages of labor will reach their highest point.

And does not the capital, which performs all this service, merit quite as much of compensation as the labor which it has employed? How has this capital been accumulated? Only as the result of long abstinence and saving. The owner might have spent it upon himself, his houses, his grounds, his pleasures. But he chooses, instead, to abstain from this personal expenditure, and to devote his gains to the support of labor. And the proceeds of that labor he takes again, and with them supports *new* labor, so giving employment, and it may be, happiness, to hundreds. Does not this abstinence on his part deserve to be rewarded? Will men continue thus to abstain, unless their abstinence meets with some reward? And then the risks of production, the chances of falling markets, and of losses from unsold goods, the accidents of fire and flood, of thieves and insolvent debtors, of unsuccessful ventures and ultimate failure,— who will encounter these without the prospect of a corresponding reward? And lastly, the skill and foresight, the knowledge of markets, the business-training of years, — is all this to pass for naught? All this goes to making up the value of the product, quite as much as the manual labor of the workman,— and on every principle of justice, as well as of economics, it deserves its fair share of the profit and reward.

This slight consideration of the nature of capital is at least sufficient to show us the folly of the measure for which socialists often clamor so loudly, and which they conceive to be a permanent remedy for the evils of poverty, and for all inequalities of condition among mankind. I mean a compulsory division of capital among all classes of society, and the prevention by law of any but an exceedingly limited accumulation. Aside from the impracticability of the scheme, even at the outset, and the disastrous effects upon society of withdrawing the strongest motives to industry, think for a moment of its effects upon the condition of those who received its original benefits. Remember that capital is a fund preserved from the inroads of personal expenditure. In order to produce anything, it must be constantly consumed

in paying wages. Like a river, it remains the same only by flowing on and changing its place every moment. Divide up this fund among the poor, so that it is consumed upon personal expenses,— and it is lost. Suppose I should go to my city-market on market-day, and seeing the bountiful supply of meats and vegetables there, should fancy that I had discovered a means of banishing hunger from the town, and with this view should buy up the whole supply and order an equal distribution to every family of the population. The quantity seems very great,— but how long will it last? Have I done away with hunger forever? Why, no! by the time next market-day came round, everybody would be just as hungry as before. So the capital of a country is no permanent thing, but a fund that must be continually renewed by labor. To make a forced distribution of it among all classes, would be simply to waste the whole, to reduce all to the same level of poverty and starvation, and to deprive them of the very motives and means which they would need to raise them above their misery.

A proper conception of the nature of capital enables us also to see how misguided, and blind to their own interest, are those who look upon capital as the natural enemy of labor. How often do workmen regard their labor as an unjust exaction, either in its kind or in its extent, and with that view set themselves deliberately to do just as little as may be for the money they receive. I fear that the idea of mutual advantage in a bargain, the idea of just and hearty service, the idea of wages honestly and fairly earned, is fading out of the minds of the workmen of this generation. And then comes in the notion that somehow, by artificial arrangements, by combination or by legislation, more money can be got for less work, labor of poor quality can be made to get as much pay as labor of good quality, and force or threats can be made to accomplish what reason and the freedom of the market cannot accomplish. It is not combination to which we should object,— the laws of demand and supply do not execute themselves; higher prices will never be got unless demanded;— but what is objectionable is the hampering of the laborer's freedom; the subjection of his will to the irresponsible and despotic authority of trades-unions and committees; the closing up of the avenues of labor to all but members of a guild; in other words, the bringing back of the restrictions upon labor which have so hindered human development in centuries past. Free competition is the life of trade,— and the workman, in his effort to get unjust advantage over the employer, only illustrates the common doctrine of Christianity and of Political Economy that overweening selfishness is fatal to the interest and welfare of him who indulges it.

It is interesting and hopeful to see that the members of the trades-unions in England are beginning to appreciate the great injustice and suicidal character of forced strikes for higher wages, and are taking measures to avoid them. It argues a more intelligent apprehension of the relations between labor and capital, that a recent Conference in London representing no less than 700,000 men, members of the various trades-unions all over the country, solemnly resolved that, for the future, recourse should in no place or circumstances be made to a strike, but that all disputes should be referred, as they arose, to joint delegations of employers and employed, presided over by an umpire. And the partial solution, by means of arbitration, of disputes between the miners of Pennsylvania and the companies that employ them,

is a mark of progress which we may trust will not be without its lessons to all departments of trade throughout our own land. For labor to impose arbitrary exactions upon capital, with the hope that any permanent benefit can be derived therefrom, is only to repeat the fallacy which Æsop ridiculed so long ago, when he told about the hands and feet, the hands and mouth, declaring that they would no longer serve the stomach or furnish it with its supplies. They forgot that the stomach supplied them with strength and sinew, quite as much as they supplied it with food; and they saw their mistake when the hands and feet could move no longer, and the eyes and mouth had closed in death.

While labor has its duties, however, it is no less certain that capital has its duties also. As it is for the interest of labor to have an eye to the rights of capital, so it is for the interest of capital to have an eye to the rights of labor. I think it cannot be doubted that as labor becomes more intelligent, it will claim and justly claim a somewhat larger share of profits than has been hitherto awarded it. It will justly claim more, because it will be worth more. There is a powerful tendency in this country to independence among the working classes. With greater knowledge of the business they are doing, they have a stronger feeling of ownership in a part of its products. There was a time when employers could hide the amount of their profits,—could, by combination among themselves, keep down the price of labor while they themselves were getting rich. But that day is passing by. The condition of the various trades and manufactures is becoming a public matter, and employers will be obliged, either to give their employees something equivalent to an interest in the business, or to see them set up coöperative establishments for themselves. We may safely say that the working men of this country are less and less inclined to work for mere wages,—they will yet demand with their whole soul that they may have an interest in the things they make. This doubtless will lead to the formation of coöperative establishments in continually greater number and on a continually greater scale. The beginnings that have been made in this direction, with their weakness and frequent failure, ought not to blind us to the real value of the principle nor to the possibility of its successful operation. Paris has now several hundred such manufactories, many of which are leading houses in their respective trades. England can point to Briggs's Colliery and to the Crossley Carpet Manufactory as notable examples of success in the same line—examples where the accumulated capital has reached hundreds of thousands of pounds. Coöperation has one great element of success—the personal interest of every man in his work,—but it also has one element of weakness —the difficulty of securing competent management by the payment of mere salary. A man after all manages his *own* business best, and is best trained *for* his own business by that very management. If employers can combine, with this great advantage of personal supervision, the other advantage of giving each workman some direct interest in the profits of the concern, the double benefit would, in all probability, outweigh any incidental evils or difficulties arising from the union of the two, and do much to solve the problem of capital and labor. And examples of such management are not wanting. Leclaire, a house painter of Paris, as Mr. Mill informs us, employs two hundred workmen. These he pays in the usual manner by fixed wages or

salaries. He assigns to himself, besides interest on the capital invested, a fixed allowance for his labor and responsibility as manager. At the end of the year the surplus profits are divided among all, himself included, in the proportion of their salaries. He has not only done for years a large business and acquired a handsome competence, but has found his account in the admirable activity and zeal of his workmen, and in the kindly relations that have subsisted between himself and them. Dupont, a printer of Paris, employing three hundred men, has found the distribution among them of even a tenth part of the profits, though this does not amount in a year to more than a fortnight's extra wages, to be a means of stimulating industry and of improving the products of his office to a degree which far more than repays the outlay.

All that is intended in these remarks, however, is to draw attention to the tendencies of the day and to the illustration which they furnish of the great truth of social and moral science, that all classes of society, even those which commonly look most suspiciously upon each other, have a common interest and are bound to work harmoniously together. In the full recognition of this truth we see the greatest hope of labor. The increase of capital ought not to be matter of apprehension to the laborer since, with every increase, there must be greater competition among capitalists, and a consequent advance in the workman's share of profits in every branch of trade. In this fact of Political Economy, that capital increases faster than population, lies a prophecy of the gradual advance of the laboring classes in comfort and intelligence, since this secures for them the certainty of a constant increase of wages. And, as for the great evils expected to result from the combination of capitalists and the restriction of manufactures to vast establishments, we may set over against these, the principle of association, which enables workmen also to combine, not to secure by threats or violence what does not belong to them by right, but to unite the little fragments of capital which each possesses, until they form a fund large enough for successful competition with the capitalists themselves. The only remedy for the evils of coöperation is coöperation — coöperation either of capitalists with laborers, so that the one share to some fair degree the profits of the other, or coöperation of laborers with one another, so that they virtually become capitalists themselves, working for their own interest most effectually when they work for the body to which they belong.

The realization of this hope, upon any large or general scale, may seem to many to be impracticable, or at least very far away. Many will insist that neither the laws of Political Economy, nor of Christianity, will ever really regulate the action of mankind. Selfishness rules the day, they will say: and, the more grasping and unprincipled it is, the greater will be its success. They will point to merchant princes whose wealth has been coined out of the hearts and brains of ten thousand toilers — toilers whom they have remorselessly trampled under foot. But these are the exceptions, not the rule, and the real lesson they teach is a far different one from this. For one who has reached a competency by iniquity, a hundred have failed,— and the noblest successes have been successes of another sort. A Brassey in England, and a Krupp in Germany, have shown that whole armies of workmen may be managed, not as machines, but as sentient and moral agents,

with the highest advantage to the governing power that directs them. In the general, and in the long run, honesty and kindness are the best policy. God has not disjoined the physical from the moral laws of his universe, nor made it best that men, even so far as worldly prospects, are concerned, should play the villain. The highest prosperity, whether for the individual or society is, in spite of temporary and insignificant exceptions, conditioned upon obedience to God's laws. And it does good to proclaim these laws. It will benefit the working-classes to know that their true interest lies in their own hands — in frugality, intelligence, union with others. Only as they save the proceeds of their labor, and associate themselves with their fellows, will they lift themselves up to comfort and independence. It will benefit the holders of capital to know that they owe a duty to workmen beyond that of mere payment of wages,— namely, the duty of doing what they can to elevate the general character of those whom they employ,— and that this duty is identical with their own ultimate and highest interest. There may be difficulties in the way of applying just principles,— but if capitalists and workmen can be only educated into a right disposition, we may be sure that, where there is a will, there is also a way.

I have confidence that Providence is turning the thoughts of both the scientific and religious world to these questions, in order that the relations between capital and labor may be settled upon a just and enduring basis. There may be temporary strife and chaos of opinions, but out of all this light will come. Nothing is so much to be deprecated as the haste and passion and ignorance on the one hand, or the short-sighted avarice on the other, which would precipitate conflict between these two great factors of production. Nothing is more to be desired than such a thorough inculcation of correct principles, and such a growth in mutual respect for each other's rights, that war between them will be impossible. Neither the demands of Political Economy, nor of Christianity, will be satisfied until both perceive that their interests are one, begin to seek each other's good, and bring in benevolence as an element in all their relations. Then will be brought about the glorious deliverance and crowning of labor, to which so many noble hearts have looked forward, and for which so many have vainly sighed. Who can refuse to add his prayer for that consummation, when he reads the sorrowful but inspiring song of that poet of labor, Gerald Massey :

" High hopes, that burned like stars sublime,
Go down in the heavens of freedom ;
And true hearts perish in the time
We bitterliest need them ;
But never sit we down and say,
There's nothing left but sorrow ;
We walk the wilderness to-day
The promised land to-morrow.

" Through all the long dark night of years,
The people's cry ascendeth :
And earth is wet with blood and tears,—
But our meek sufferance endeth ;
The few shall not forever sway,
The many moil in sorrow :
The powers of hell are strong to-day
But Christ shall rise to-morrow.

"Build up heroic lives, and all
Be like a sheathen sabre,
Ready to flash out at God's call,
O chivalry of labor!
Triumph and toil are twins, and aye
Joy suns the cloud of sorrow,
And 't is the martyrdom to-day,
Brings victory to-morrow."

The same principles might be applied, as I have intimated, and in an extended discussion should be applied, to other relations than those between Capital and Labor. There, for example, is the relation between luxurious consumption and the productive industry of a country, between the desire for unlimited accumulation and the educational or æsthetic needs of society, between the great corporations which threaten to control our legislation and the public whose franchise they have obtained, between the security of the national creditor and the financial prosperity of the land, between the freedom of commerce from all needless restrictions of impost or tax and the merging of all race-hatreds in a universal human brotherhood. The mere mention of these various relations suggests the vastness of the field over which Political Economy and Christianity hold joint jurisdiction, and the greatness of the service which the one may render to the other. Political Economy has limits beyond which it cannot go. Upon those boundaries it stands and calls for Christianity to be its helper. I find, in Mr. Walker's "Science of Wealth," a quotation from Bastiat, which plainly shows this with regard to the single matter of *value*. "In order," he says, "that a service should possess value, in the economical sense of the word, it is not at all indispensable that it should be real, conscientious and useful service. It is sufficient that it is accepted and paid for by another service. It depends wholly on the judgment we form in each case; and this is the reason why morals will always be the best auxiliary of Political Economy. Economic Science would be impossible if we admitted as values only values correctly and judiciously appreciated." It is at just this point, indicated by the French economist, that Christianity comes in to rectify our ideas of value. It sets up its spiritual standards over against the materialism which would make earthly wealth the supreme and only good. Political Economy, left to itself, can never reach the ends which it proposes. Man's highest self-interest is often in conflict with a lower self-interest, which contradicts the first, and the lower obscures the higher,—the speck upon the window-pane is larger to the sight than the house upon the distant mountain-side. What can correct the errors of a narrow self-interest, that looks only to the near and the present, but that faith which is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and the love whose arms take into their broad embrace the whole universe of things, and the whole eternity of God?

Thus Political Economy gives us, on a lower plane, the same truths which the gospel had uttered long ago. Thus Political Economy illustrates Christianity, and proves it to have the same Author with the laws of nature. Thus Political Economy prepares the way for Christ, by laying down demands which require the gospel as their natural complement. Economical laws indeed serve much the same purpose as was served by the Mosaic law. That

law prevented depraved humanity from sinking so low as it would have sunk without restraint or tutelage; yet, with all this negative service, the law had no power to lift man up to a higher life. In like manner, the laws of self-interest, to use the language of Professor Bascom, "catch man when he falls from God's life and love," and prevent him from going so far toward ruin as he otherwise would do, yet they have no power of themselves to restore him to the height from which he has fallen. Though self-interest and true benevolence speak the same language, and seek the same thing, self-interest lays down a law which she is powerless of herself to obey.—The Mosaic law, again, prepared the way for the gospel, by foreshadowing its truths, and pointing away from itself to Christ as the only source of life and power. So Social Science prepares the way for Christianity by dimly foreshadowing its truths and pointing away from itself to another, who alone can complete what it lacks and furnish the fulfillment of its demands. Human nature can fulfill the demands of the highest self-interest only through the access of a higher power—a power of love and life. In this way, the social laws which govern mankind interlock with the moral laws, and require these to complement their own insufficiency and weakness. How could this be, if religion were not from the same source as nature? How could this be, if both were not true and both divine?

Thus Political Economy and Christianity are indissolubly wedded. "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." But let us not mistake their relative rank and importance. Although Political Economy helps and furthers the cause of true religion, her place is second, not first. And in this we get a glimpse of the relation of science in general to the religion which we profess. Social Science stands only as the representative of all the sciences, when she acknowledges her own inferiority, and serves as a school-master to bring the world to Christ. Uttering a stern and inexorable law, she knows of none but Christ in whom that law may become a law of liberty and the hardness of self-interest melt into the round soft shape of love. And therefore, not science, but Christianity, is the hope of mankind. No powers of merely natural progress can ever lead humanity to its goal. The race, like the individual, must have a higher guidance than that of its own instincts and intuitions. Even the earthly Paradise of the philosopher and the poet can never be reached by the help of science alone. And the heavenly Paradise,—how infinitely far away, how barred to all access it is, until Christ comes out from the golden doors to take us with his pierced hand and lead us thither!

The banyan-tree of the East Indies, is distinguished from other trees in this, that it never ceases growing. Travelers tell us that its branches throw out new roots, at first consisting of slender fibres, hanging in the air and growing downward, but ultimately reaching the earth's surface and striking in, until they themselves become minor trunks which send out new branches in their turn. At length the great parent trunk comes to resemble the central column of a cathedral chapter-house, with scores of subordinate shafts around it, each helping to support the vaulted canopy above, and adding grace and beauty to the leafy temple. In some such way as this, we may picture to ourselves the connection between Christianity and the sciences which tend to ameliorate human conditions. In a true sense they

are the offspring of Christianity itself. Sent forth at first as aerial rootlets, they have at last found resting place and new foundation in the solid ground of fact, and from that time serve as independent witnesses to the truth and supporters of it. They are not to be dissevered from it, for their life and the life of the great central trunk is one. Thus, receiving strength as well as giving, all human knowledges stand humbly and reverently around the religion of love, the religion of the cross. Evermore shall Christianity, in its everlasting growth, send down new roots of arts and science and civilization, and these shall repay their debt by guarding and strengthening their common mother, until the giant tree shall have embraced in itself all the results of the broadest and noblest human thought, reducing them to order as subordinate parts of one great system of which it is the centre, sanctifying and pervading them with its own divine life, and uniting all in one organic structure of faith and knowledge, so vast and so free, that all mankind may come beneath its branches and enjoy its shade and blessing. And so, "In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, shall be the tree of life, which beareth twelve manner of fruits, and yieldeth her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree shall be for the healing of the nations."

XLV.

GETTING AND SPENDING.*

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :—I thank you for this most kind and cordial greeting. These lights and flowers, this handsome entertainment and pleasant talk, represent to me the social side of Christianity. I do not wonder at the tendency of our population to the cities. The human heart feels the need of stir and sympathy. I am glad that when we get to heaven we are not to live in the country. The book of Revelation tells us that the New Jerusalem is a city, and I suppose our business is to make life here an earnest and type of that closeness of Christian companionship, and that intensity of loving activity, which belong to the city of God.

A Social Union cannot further this end in any better way than by encouraging the quiet and unpartisan discussion of social questions — especially such questions as the pulpit finds it difficult to treat. Well-to-do people have problems of their own. The answers which they give are not the same answers that were commonly given fifty years ago, but they are given just as conscientiously. What position shall we take with regard to new social customs which challenge either our acceptance or rejection? How shall we admit all the real sweetness and light of a refined civilization, while yet we keep our hearts safe from the serpent and the sting, that lurk beneath the flowers? How shall we keep an independent judgment amid the clamorous petitioners for our benevolent contributions, and yet never say: "Get thee behind me, God!" instead of "Get thee behind me, Satan?" We hear much about the trials of poverty. Something needs to be said about the trials of wealth. It is out of what I may, without much of jest, call a heart of deep sympathy for the rich, that I propose to speak to you for a moment or two of The Christian Law of Getting and of Spending.

It is a mistake to suppose that Christianity requires a man to be poor. Abraham was a good Christian,— at least, he was the father of all believers,— and yet he was very rich. Job had a large property, and, though he lost it all, it was all returned to him, and more. I have no idea that the young man in the gospels would have been compelled to sell all that he had, if he had been willing to sell all that he had. Riches are recognized in Scripture, not only as a good, but as a means of doing good. Men may misuse them, but wealth is a blessing, an opportunity, an honor, a power. It is not money, but the supreme love of money, that is the root of all evil. Christianity promotes the virtues that *make* wealth — temperance, industry, foresight, self-denial. If all men were Christians, all men would be rich. Some day the meek will inherit the earth. The church is poor, mainly because she is

*An Address at the "Ladies' Meeting" of the New York Baptist Social Union, Delmonico's, November 1, 1883.

stingy. When she consecrates her all to God, God will give all to her; the kings of the earth — among whom are included capitalists — shall bring their glory and honor into her; the riches of the world shall be brought into her treasury, because her treasury and the treasury of Christ shall be one.

This is not only good Christianity, but it is good Political Economy. There is a certain dignity in the origin of capital, for it is the produce of past labor, and is the result of saving. Capital never could have come into existence, except through a sacrifice of present good for the sake of the future. It takes a certain measure of intellectual and moral development to make accumulation possible. Bagehot, the English economist, says that all the Bourses, Exchanges, Chambers of Commerce, ought to erect statues to the man who first taught his fellows to live a year in advance by casting seed into the ground,— for he was the most daring and original of all speculators. Our savings banks prove that large classes of people have advanced to what, economically considered, is a high level of patience and thoughtfulness and faith. You never heard of a savings bank among the Hottentots. And to accumulate great properties, and to hold them together, involve the exercise of these same virtues in a yet larger degree.

Capital has a dignity due to its origin in labor and saving. But it has also a dignity derived from the use to which it is put. It is the help and support of labor. Everything saved from the produce of past labor, and made to help in new production, is of the nature of capital. Even the workman who merely owns his tools is an incipient capitalist. And the great capitalist is only a man who, as the result of his own or others' savings, has got into his possession a larger set of tools. As no trade can be carried on without tools, so no business can be carried on without capital, and no great business can be carried on without great capital. Capital is a fund that employs workmen. The capitalist therefore is the greatest friend that the laborer has,— for you cannot have any more industry than you have capital to support it. It is for the interest of the world that some men should have great wealth,— for that wealth is productive to the owner only by performing, like the waters of the earth, a constant circuit. Now it is the rain that fertilizes the fields of agriculture; now it is the mountain stream that drives the mill-wheel of manufactures; now it is the broad sea that bears upon its bosom the fleets of commerce. Without the principle of accumulation, without aggregations of capital, without rich men, great public works would be impossible, the progress of the race would cease, and mankind would go back to barbarism.

It is well to be rich, and neither Christianity nor Political Economy has anything to say against it. But how rich is it well to be? What is the law and limit of accumulation? I am not now asking with regard to limitations from without, in the shape of legal provisions, though John Stuart Mill thought that the excessive concentration of wealth in the hands of a few should be guarded against by limiting the amount which one can acquire by inheritance. This reminds me of Dr. Johnson's peculiar eulogy. Dr. Johnson praised the English system of primogeniture, because "it made only one fool in a family,"— all but the eldest son had to work for their living. There is a tyranny over the markets which is as arbitrary as the rule of the Sultan, and it is a question whether this tyranny ought not to be rendered less dangerous to the public by practically limiting estates to the amount which each

man can acquire by his own industry during a single life-time. Nor am I asking now with regard to the limitations imposed by merely economical considerations, such as the shortness of life, the decay of one's own powers, the increasing burdens that attend upon increasing wealth, and the uncertainty whether others who come after us, and who legally inherit our estates, will be able to manage the property which we get together. You remember the merchant in the Arabian Nights who let loose an imprisoned Genie, only to find that the Genie stood over him with drawn sword threatening his life. Should not this consideration that the wealth we create may become master instead of servant, to our children if not to ourselves, have something to do in determining when we should cease to accumulate, and should begin to give away?

But the question which I wish to ask is this: What limitations upon accumulation should a sense of our relation to Christ impose? I take it for granted that we all agree with regard to the spirit and aim with which the acquisition of wealth should be conducted. We are not to make money for money's sake. That makes a man an idolater, just as much as if he worshiped a god of gold. Nor are we to make money simply to gratify a selfish ambition. The love of power grows by what it feeds on; it would not be satisfied, even if the world lay at its feet; it is a consuming passion, and all the generous and spiritual elements of character melt in its fervent heat. We are equally agreed that a Christian man belongs, with all that he has, to Christ; that, as Christ has given him his talent for money-making, he is to use this talent in the interest of the Giver. I should say that he has no right to retire from business simply to save himself trouble, and no right to do a small business when he can just as safely do a large one. He is bound to make what he has of property and ability productive for the great Owner of whom he is only steward and trustee,—and, not only productive, but productive in the highest degree possible to the powers with which Christ has endowed him.

Some of you may think that, in saying this, I am removing all limits to accumulation. Not so. It is the utmost possible production, to which we are bound, not the utmost possible accumulation. And production of what? Woolen goods and railroad dividends? Oh no! there was a higher sort of production to which you devoted yourself when you became a Christian man, namely, the production of holiness in the earth. Keeping your money going as capital is not enough, if you are a Christian. You might as well have it sunk in the sea, as to have it producing nothing in the way of the furtherance of the kingdom of God. And productiveness in this sense must limit the principle of mere accumulation.

Suppose we test this matter by applying the rule in other departments of human activity. Here is a man eager for knowledge. His temptation is to seclude himself from his fellow-men, and to forget both God and humanity in his avidity for learning. How much knowledge may he rightfully accumulate? You answer at once: Just so much as is consistent with a healthy recognition of God's claims upon his soul, and the world's claims upon his service. In other words, he must make his learning productive,—as Lord Bacon says, "a rich storehouse for God's glory and man's relief,"—or his learning will eat into his soul like a canker. Accumulation of knowledge,

to be Christian, must be not only with a view to ultimate wider distribution, but it must be accompanied by continual distribution. The trustees of a hospital who should allow its funds to accumulate without end, instead of appropriating them to the relief of the wounded and the sick, would be unfaithful to their trust. So to accumulate knowledge without end is unfaithfulness to a higher trust, and to accumulate wealth without distributing is equal malfeasance in the office of a steward.

What I have said about capital will show you that I have no sympathy with the popular prejudice against capitalists which regards them as mere blood-suckers fastened upon the body politic. No, their money, whether lent out, or invested in stocks, or put into trade, is doing work, and in an economical sense is producing something continually, however little it may be producing in a spiritual sense. Every capitalist is a business man. When we come, therefore, to the practical application of this doctrine of producing for God, the question is substantially this: What proportion of my property and its income may I properly use in business? how large a business may I conduct? how great a capital may I use? how great an estate may I gather? These questions are all practically the same. I have no doubt that the day of small things has gone by. Daniel Safford, that model of benevolence of whom we heard so much when we were boys, vowed to God that he would never be worth more than $50,000, and all that he made over and above that, he faithfully gave away. But by limiting his capital, he limited its produce, and so limited his gifts. If a man's powers are equal to the larger production, I have grave doubts whether he has a right to put the limits of his fortune where Daniel Safford put it. For some men, it would be wrong to stop even with $500,000 or $5,000,000. But let us be sure about our powers, and about our motive. Are we gathering for God, or for ourselves? Is production in an economical sense subserving the other sort of production — production in the religious and spiritual sense? Do not tell me that you intend to make it so by and by. You never will be any better than you are now,— at least you have no right to presume that you will be. Unless you make the principle of accumulation subservient to the principle of benevolence now, you have no right to believe that you ever will, or that your wealth will be other than a curse instead of a blessing.

Have I seemed to imply, in this address, that we are all millionaires? Well, we certainly look as if we were. But, lest there should be a single unfortunate exception, who has not yet received his portion of meat from this feast of reason, let me say a word or two about *spending* as I have already about *getting*. We all must spend. We are all consumers. It takes only a little while for the world to eat itself up. "Though full of useful and precious goods," says Dr. Walker, without constant new production "the world would be seedy within ten years, and beggarly within the life of man." And we consume luxuries as well as necessaries,— in fact, in our modern days a great many things once called luxuries have become necessaries. And this is perfectly right. God does not bring about a high development of our faculties without providing a corresponding nutriment and supply. The talk about "plain living and high thinking," is mostly talk. An active brain needs good food. A hard-worked man will live longer for having a good bed. Good fires and good clothes are dimin-

ishing the chances of death and are enriching the life insurance companies. And God cares for men's tastes, for he has created them in the image of his own. He himself loves beauty, and he has made us to love it — the beauty of nature not only, but the beauty of art — symphonies and statues, pictures and noble piles of architecture. It is just as right, within certain limits, to spend money for such things, as it is to spend it for daily bread. But as Christian people, it is very important to understand the principle and the limit of this luxurious consumption.

I hear a false principle frequently advocated. I do not say that any of us advocate it. I will illustrate it by the court of the third Napoleon. When a lady of the court appeared a second time in the same dress, the Empress Eugenie gently admonished her that she had "admired that dress before." And the wasteful extravagance of the Tuilleries was defended, upon the ground that it kept a great many silk manufacturers and milliners at work, and so encouraged industry. Well, it would keep men at work, to some extent, if we spread gold broad-cast over our walls, and had for our dinners, as the Romans did, dishes composed of the brains of birds of Paradise. But who does not see that it will keep more men at work, and for a longer time, to put the same sum into productive business? $1,000, spent in luxury, will pay $1,000 of wages. $1,000, employed as capital, will in ten years pay $20,000 of wages, and will go on increasing its power of supporting labor so long as it is thus employed. As a celebrated economist has said :— "Wealth spent in luxury is the fierce blaze of the burning house, which may warm a few for a moment, but which soon goes out, leaving only desolation."

And so we see the Christian limit of luxurious consumption. We must be able to show that our spending does the greatest possible good. Though we were worth a hundred millions, it never would be right to waste. We are stewards of God's estate ; we own nothing in fee-simple ; we are set to administer our earthly property for God. Now a temperate and well proportioned luxury, by which I mean a proper provision for the satisfaction of our tastes and social instincts, *does* bring forth fruit for God, both in ourselves and in others. Such luxury is a spring of beneficent activity ; it stimulates men for life's toils ; it repairs life's waste ; it lets loose our higher powers ; it repays its cost many times over. The Athenian Stoic was content with "figs and philosophy." We need something more. I once saw a Christian home, where I thought luxury and principle went hand in hand. It was a solid, spacious, English-like structure. There were servants, and there was plate. There were pictures of worth, and costly books. But there was not the slightest ostentation. One would have thought the family had lived there a thousand years. And when the son of the family greeted me — a beautiful youth, six feet and two inches tall and straight as an arrow, ingenuous and modest, yet with a natural distinction of manner that showed that he was "to the manor born," I recognized the fact that wealth had not spoiled, but had helped, education.

You say I have not yet told you how far this expenditure may go. I will tell you now. Just so far as is consistent with loving God supremely, and your neighbor as yourself. No luxury can be Christian, that tends to lead my neighbor into sin. The traveler on one of the splendid steamers of the river Rhine sometimes observes that the engines have suddenly stopped.

Looking ahead he perceives a low, grimy coal-barge, so heavily laden that her gunwales are near the water's edge. The swell in the wake of the great steamer, if she kept up her full speed, would be sufficient to wash over the sides of the barge and sink her. So the larger vessel stops her engines and, with the momentum already gained, glides quietly by till the barge is out of danger. We are to consult the interests of others, and not to please ourselves. Let us be sure that the swell and bravery of our display and indulgence does not sink some humbler craft, which otherwise might have reached its destined haven.

No luxury can be Christian, that hardens the heart against the calls of distress. When the heavy draperies of our curtains become so thick as wholly to shut out the wail of the great suffering and sinning race, then the curtains had better come down. No luxury can be Christian, which makes this life, with its glitter and its pleasure, the be-all and the end-all of existence.

> "This life of mortal breath
> Is ante-chamber to the life Elysian,
> Whose portal we call death."

The luxury that would persuade us to find our Paradise here, and to forget the Paradise beyond, is a false luxury, and full of poison to the soul. Beauty and pleasure are not ends in themselves, but means to a higher end — the production of the true and the good, and the preparation of our souls for heaven. As Bonar, the sweetest religious poet of Scotland, has sung :—

> "'Tis first the true and then the beautiful,
> Not first the beautiful and then the true;
> First the wild moor, with rock and sedge and pool,
> Then the gay garden, rich in scent and hue.
>
> "'Tis first the good and then the beautiful,
> Not first the beautiful and then the good;
> First the rough seed, sown in the rougher soil,
> Then the flower trellis, and the branching wood.
>
> "Not first the glad and then the sorrowful,
> But first the sorrowful and then the glad;
> Tears for a day — for earth of tears is full,—
> Then we forget that we were ever sad.
>
> "Not first the bright and after that the dark,
> But first the dark and after that the bright;
> First the black cloud, and then the rainbow's arc,
> First the dark grave, then resurrection light.
>
> "'Tis first the night — dark night of storm and war,
> Thick night of heavy clouds and veiled skies;
> Then the fair sparkle of the morning star,
> That bids the saints awake, and dawn arise."

And so Christianity bids us bear one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ. Are you rich? Then it would seem to me that you ought not to spend more upon yourself, than you spend on others. And if you are *very* rich why should you not use your opportunity to give *all* your increase to God, that with it he may send the gospel into the heart of some heathen empire, or build up some great institution that shall train the future teachers of the church? And still you wish to ask me further questions — about horses, and pictures, and yachts? Well, I am glad that I am not set to be the keeper of your conscience, or any other human being's but my own.

God gives us his law of love and the example of Christ's sacrifice,— and he says to us : "As I have loved you, so love my cause. Do all to the glory of God. He that soweth sparingly shall reap sparingly, but he that soweth bountifully shall reap bountifully. As the Lord hath prospered you, so give. Be good stewards of the manifold grace of God." It indicates the rank and dignity of each of us in the creation that, with these principles before us, we are left to determine our duty solitarily before God. Life is a probation,— our characters are revealing themselves,— we are fixing our place and destiny for eternity. But nothing in our earthly life will better show what we are, and where we belong forever, than our getting and spending.

XLVI.

RECOLLECTIONS OF THE EAST.*

The subject of this lecture is Egypt and Palestine. But do not mistake me,— I do not mean the Egypt and Palestine about which you have heard so much, and upon which it is so eminently proper to deliver lectures. That is very commonly an ideal Egypt and Palestine. The subject of my lecture is only the Egypt and Palestine that I saw. Cicero says that "the eye sees only that which it brings with it the power of seeing," and such as I have I give you,— namely, a few personal Recollections of the East. I shall not imitate a former townsman of mine, who began his history of Rochester with an account of the glacial epoch, nor shall I follow the example of Knickerbocker's History of New York, which commences with the Creation. I shall take you at once to the gates of the Orient. I shall claim the privilege of being as uninstructive as I please. If any of you have ever read Mr. Kinglake's Eothen, that rose-colored but fascinating book of Eastern travel, you have not forgotten the solemn strain in which the author warns his readers, in the preface, that from all useful information, from all valuable statistics, and from all moral and religious reflections, his work will be thoroughly free. I am half inclined to begin my lecture with a like warning. I wish, at least, to bar all disappointment, by premising that I am to give, not an elaborate and logical and scientific account of Egypt and the Holy Land, but simply a few jottings of what I saw, and how I felt, as I wandered through those regions of ancient story.

Very early one morning, in the latter part of March, the Frenchman who occupied the lower berth of the state-room woke me with the words: "Alexandrie,— Alexandrie!" We had been steaming it all the way from Naples and Malta for the last four days, and I had got quite a sufficient idea of the extent of the Mediterranean. I needed no second call, and in a few moments was on deck. During the night we had anchored in the harbor, and now, as the sun rose and the morning breeze played upon the surface of the water, I took my first view of Alexandria. The picture-books were all true, and more than true. Unmistakably Egyptian was the long low shore-line of yellow sand, and the long yellow line of city houses. Here and there an isolated palm tree seemed like an emerald in a golden setting, while on the outskirts of the city were patches of green grass and groves of palms whose trunks looked like slender columns of a temple, supporting a roof of Gothic fan-work. The golden glow of the East was over all. The morning was warm, but bright and cloudless — a perfect Egyptian spring morning. In four days I had journeyed from April to June. I began to realize how that person

* A Lecture before the Robinson Rhetorical Society of the Rochester Theological Seminary, February 25, 1878.

must feel who is knocked into the middle of next week. One can live in a perpetual spring, if he will only chase it wherever it flies. Yet I must confess to something like a smiting of conscience, as I stood on the deck of Her Majesty's steamer and remembered how I had cast contempt on the almanac, and substituted one long May for December, January, February, and March.

The sun had hardly emerged above the horizon, before a dozen boats, manned by natives, put out from shore to welcome us. And what a welcome! Such yelling and gesticulation! I once thought that American hotel-runners could get up as perfect an extempore Babel as any set of mortals, but I believe now that they must yield the palm to these Egyptians. An overwhelming torrent of Arabic jargon, bearing on its bosom the *disjecta membra* of murdered French, English, and Italian words! With voices keyed at the highest pitch, and with faces apparently frantic with excitement, each one of these swarthy creatures begged, besought, implored you, to take his boat. We looked on as placidly as possible for awhile; but alas, the harbor was shallow; the steamer could not get nearer shore; we had come to see Egypt; we must leave the vessel; we could not swim ashore; we were shut up to taking a boat; and so, after driving the best bargain we could, we committed ourselves to the mercies of half a dozen stalwart tatterdemalions, with much the same feelings that one would have on resigning himself to a lot of Comanches, to be scalped or to be set up as a mark for juvenile savages to shoot at. Once in the boat, the uproar quieted down so much that we began to think our tribulations over. As we approached the shore, however, I lifted my eyes, and to my dismay beheld a regiment of Arab donkey-drivers, the only hackmen of the East, lining the whole shore where we were to land, and stretching out their arms towards us, while they uttered such ominous cries as "Mosu! Mosu! want a donkey?" Here my French friend was invaluable. I had seen him, a number of times on the voyage, affectionately fondling a good stout shillalah. I had asked him what the purpose of the stick was, but he had only replied that he had a little grudge to settle with the donkey-boys at Alexandria. Now I saw the admirable results of living on the maxim: "Forewarned, forearmed,"—for, no sooner had the Frenchman leaped on shore, than he began to lay about him like mad, right and left, front and rear, till the donkey-boys fell back in utter confusion, and he led us in triumph through the routed host.

We next fell into the clutches of the Custom House Inspector, an officer whose chief end is to collect "baksheesh," or tribute-money, for *not* examining baggage. We propitiated His Excellency with a sixpence, and escaped scot-free. Then a lot of Arab porters surrounded us. The moment the Custom House Examiner signified that the baggage was all right, half a dozen squalid wretches made a dive for each separate article, and in less time than it takes to tell it, our baggage was scattered to the four winds, and nothing was to be heard but yells of "Mosu! hotel?" It was a flank movement on the Frenchman, for his back was turned at the moment. It was only a temporary reverse however, for the thick stick came to the rescue. It brought the most obstinate to terms, and sent the rest flying. In a few minutes, we were hurrying after two or three Arabs who contracted to serve as baggage-wagons, and who succeeded, to our surprise, in shoulder-

ing all our trunks, hat-boxes, and valises. When we reached the hotel we found it completely full. On seeking another, we discovered the case to be the same there. A host of English passengers were in town on their way to India, *via* Suez. It was on toward noon before we succeeded in getting breakfast, and the crowd so completely destroyed all comfort that we concluded to take the railway that afternoon to Cairo.

That railway ride gave us a fine chance to see the Egyptian landscape. The country is very flat. Nothing like a hill is to be seen. Meadows clothed in the most beautiful verdure alternate with sandy plains and desolate yellow mounds — the only remains perhaps of ancient cities,— but mounds on which are now clustered the mud-huts of the modern Egyptians. Now and then a grove of palms varied the monotony of the scene, and twice between Cairo and Alexandria the railway crosses the Nile. I shall never forget the awe with which I first looked upon this mighty and mysterious river, on whose banks early idolatry built its temples and the first great empire of the earth arose. Here was the source of Greek mythology, and the home of the oldest science and civilization. Wonderful river! emblematic of the history and influence of the land through which it flows. With sources lost in distance, and fertilizing vast spaces of otherwise desert land, it leaves its home at last, and mingling with the sea bears Egyptian waters to Greece and Italy. The Nile was very low, but its current was swift and broad, and even in crossing it by railway we could see that it was one of the grandest of rivers. Railroading in Egypt never exceeds fifteen miles an hour, and long before we reached Cairo at midnight, we had lost all recollections of our breakfast. We did what we could to console ourselves with oranges, which the Arab boys sold at three for a penny. When we reached the great Hotel of Cairo, all was dark. Just inside the door a great stout negro porter was lying in true eastern fashion across the threshold, fast asleep. After kicking him about like a foot-ball for a few minutes, we managed to wake him, and it was not long before a number of tired *howadji* were slumbering safely inside the mosquito-nets.

Two days in Cairo — and two days only,— for the season was late, and Palestine was before us. We had to see the greatest amount possible in the smallest possible time. So, at seven o'clock the next morning, we started for the pyramids. My dragoman Selim, as is invariably the case, was the prince of interpreters and guides. Each of us mounted a stout donkey, and behind the donkeys followed the inevitable donkey-boy, armed with a long stick. We had no more to do with the running of the donkeys than a passenger has to do with the running of a railway train,— the donkey-boy was both engineer and conductor. Our business was simply to hold on, and to let the animals run. They were sometimes disinclined to go faster than a walk, and then the donkey-boy's stick was very efficacious. Though you may scarcely believe it, we rode the donkeys and the donkey-boy ran behind, thirty-six miles that day, in twelve hours, including at least an hour and a half of stoppages. That day I visited the pyramids, the Apis-Cemetery of Sakkara, and the remains of Memphis, and returned at night to Cairo, the sorest mortal that ever dismounted from a donkey.

The ride for the first few hours was very delightful. Every step showed something new in Oriental life or customs or scenery. The narrow and dirty

streets of Cairo, sometimes roofed over with matting to exclude the sun, the bazaars, with a sober, squatting, cross-legged Egyptian smoking his chibouk at the entrance of every little shop, the women with faces half-covered after the eastern custom, but with sharp black eyes that still glanced at the Frank over the edges of the dark veil, the Arab jargon of quarreling ferrymen, the camels with their long necks and ungainly strut and enormous burdens, taking up the whole street as they walked, the noble gateways adorned with Arabesques and inscriptions from the Koran, which now and then appeared among the squalid and ugly habitations of the poor, — all these were new to me. I was in the midst of the Orient. I saw dozens of boys who might have served for excellent Aladdins, and it was no small task at times to repress the fancy that I was some personage of the Arabian Nights, and living "in the days of good Haroun al Raschid." All round me were sights and sounds utterly different from the sights and sounds of Europe; it was all a new world and a new age, — no, not that, — it was the old world and the old age, which we moderns have so far, far outgrown.

Outside the city the road wound through endless groves of palm and tamarisk and cassia. The grass was green and fresh, but the flowers were all of novel shape and hue, — everywhere the brilliant and luxurious vegetation of the tropics. So, until we stood almost under the solemn shadow of the Pyramids, the morning's ride was a continual succession of beauties and surprises. Then came a change. In a few minutes, we had passed from greenness and tropical beauty to long tracts of desert sand. The Pyramids stand on the very edge of the desert. As you toil up the steep sand-covered bank on which they are built, they seem to rise before you as giant warders of that vast region of sterility and death.

The ascent of the great Pyramid was rather comical. As we passed the last straggling collection of mud-huts on our way to them, two or three Arabs from each village started up from the ground where they had been lying in the sun, and followed us, as persistently as hounds would follow a hare. When we arrived at the foot of the great Pyramid, we had about twenty of them about us, as rascally a set in appearance as one often sees. The regular charge of the Sheikh for ascending the Pyramid and exploring the interior is five English shillings, and for this sum he is compelled to furnish three stout Arabs to assist and guide each traveler. A dozen others, however, always beset you with offers of aid and demands of "baksheesh," and their importunities are not so easy to resist, especially when they have you completely in their power, as they do at some stages of your explorations. Determining in my own mind that I would yield to no such demands, and leaving all superfluous clothing and all my money behind me for safe keeping with the dragoman, I gave each hand to a lank Arab, who looked as if he would gladly cut my throat for a sixpence, and began the ascent. A third Arab followed, and furnished the "boosts" from behind. All this assistance is very necessary, — for the outside of the Pyramid, though it was originally smooth, is now a series of rough steps about three feet high.

With the help of the Arabs, the ascent at first seemed quite novel and amusing. As they pulled me up they sang a sort of chant together, the words of which were of all languages, and ran somewhat as follows: "Mosu good — hard work — no 'fraid — Jack and Jill — baksheesh; — Mas'r rest —

take care — not far — Mosu good — hard work — baksheesh." They sang it over and over again, with all sorts of variations, but I noticed that the most enthusiastic part of the song was always the "baksheesh." As we neared the half-way station, the chorus on "baksheesh" became quite overpowering. When I sat down on a stone to rest, the Arab rascals surrounded me, stuck their fists nearly into my face, and demanded a donation. Whereupon I smiled very graciously, and told them I was ready to go on again. It was not so graciously that they consented, but finally, consent they did, and in a few minutes I was upon the summit of the Great Pyramid of Cheops, four hundred and fifty feet above the plain below.

Of course I meditated more or less,— as much as the hot day and the fatiguing ascent and the bothersome Arabs would allow. Beneath my feet was the monument of one of earth's oldest dynasties — the appropriate record of a crushing despotism that fortunately ceased to curse the world as many as forty centuries ago. And yet what a monument it is — this great stone-mountain on the sandy plain! There is a science exhibited in its construction, which has never been surpassed. It is the recorded verdict of competent engineers, "that, with all the progress of modern knowledge, it would be even in our days a problem difficult to solve, to construct as did these Egyptian architects of the fourth dynasty, in such a mass as that of the Pyramid, chambers and passages which, in spite of the seven millions of tons pressing upon them, have for four thousand years preserved their original shape without crack or flaw." But what shall be said of the view from the summit? It certainly reveals to you the vanity of human ambition. The vast pile that was once reared in the midst of life and beauty now stands alone in the desert. The encroaching sands have flowed in, till around this mausoleum of Egypt's greatest monarch, all is now a solitude. The dreary yellow plain stretches away on one side, as far as the eye can reach. But while on one side all is silent and desolate as the grave, on the other side the distant prospect is as bright and beautiful as ever presented itself to Moses upon Pisgah. There is the soft green of meadow and field, of waving wheat and stately palm, all growing by the banks of the unfailing river, while the minarets of Cairo shine in the sunlight miles away. Who could help making the one side a picture of the end of earthly greatness, and the other a picture of the life and beauty that shall perpetually abide upon the banks of the river of the water of life on high?

Why should we ever come down from Pisgah? Why should there be such tribulations as Arab guides? The rest of my meditations are not recorded, because there were none. The three cut-throat-looking rascals became too obstreperous. They demanded "baksheesh." There was no escape but in starting down again — the Arabs looking daggers enough, though they did not go so far as to show any. And I found my account in not yielding to them. When we came to the narrow passage-way more than half-way down, which leads you into the very heart of the Pyramid, I was relieved of the company of a dozen or more supernumerary savages who were waiting there for the opportunity of entering with me. Woe to the man to whom that happens! Woe to the man who has to witness an Arab dance in the King's Chamber, through the stifling dust kicked up by a score of naked feet, and then has to pay for it roundly or submit to have his lights blown out, and be

left to find his way to the open air alone! Such things have been. Upon this occasion, however, only two Arabs accompanied me. I saw the interior of the Pyramid under quite favorable circumstances. I confess that I have no desire ever to see it again. Of all places in the world detestable to sensitive knees and nostrils, commend me to the passages of the great Pyramid. The entrance-passage is only four feet high, and as we held our candles in our hands and went bending half double all the way, through an air in which seemed concentrated all the heat of Egypt's suns and all the choking dust of Egypt's deserts, the impressions we received were, to say the least, not wholly agreeable. On reaching the bottom of the first passage, which inclines downward for sixty feet or so, a turn to the right brings you to a place where you are obliged to ascend a perpendicular wall for a little distance, by putting your feet into the crevices of the stones. This brings you to the second passage, which takes you up a steep incline a hundred and twenty feet long, and as low and fatiguing as the first. Here you pass the entrance to what was once called the great well of the Pyramid — a well that was said to penetrate far below its foundation and to connect with the Nile, but which more recent investigations have shown to lead to a subterranean chamber, and which, with the chamber itself, is above the highest level of the overflow of the river. After this comes a third low horizontal passage-way which conducts you to the King's Chamber, a room thirty-four feet long by seventeen broad and nineteen in height. Lighted only by a couple of candles, this apartment seemed dusky enough. The air was thick and heavy, and, though it was a relief to stand upright once more, the gloom and undefined extent of this dark and silent chamber were quite oppressive. I was scarcely in it before I should have been glad to be out. At one end are still the remains of a sarcophagus, hacked and hammered at by tourists, in which a king of Egypt lay undisturbed so many centuries. The first plunderers of the Pyramids doubtless stole the wooden coffin, with the mummy and treasures it contained, and thus prevented it from gracing the shelf of some foreign Museum. Old Sir Thomas Brown said well: "In vain do men hope for preservation below the moon. Mummy has become merchandise, and Pharaoh is sold for balsams."

But, not to describe the exit from the Pyramid and the hot ride over the scorching sand to Sakkara and Memphis, let me simply say that it was quite late when we got back to Cairo. The sun went down in a cloudless sky, and yet the sunset was peculiarly deep and glowing. The air itself seemed tinged with yellow and crimson, and the whole west was radiant with golden light. There was no twilight. Scarcely had the sun set, when it was already dark and cold. The stars came out, with that intense and piercing lustre that is never seen save in an Eastern clime. I could not wonder that Astronomy was first of sciences, or that the wandering tribes who watched their flocks by night could gaze upon these stars in their long walks through the sky, and could imagine that they had peculiar and intimate relations with all human fortunes. I could have looked at them myself till they paled before the rising day. We made a triumphal entry into Cairo after the successful accomplishment of that day's tour, — an entry that deserves to be commemorated. The donkey-boy, after his thirty-six miles' run, kept the donkeys still at full speed, and trotted behind, panting like a dog, and

belaboring the beasts as he went. The streets of Cairo were crowded with men, women and children,—many of them with what looked like Chinese paper lanterns in their hands. It was a regulation of the police, in fact, that no person should walk the streets at night without one. But police were not worth much in Cairo. There was no gas, and many of the streets, especially the less important and more narrow of them, though full of human beings, were wrapped in the blackest darkness. I first understood that evening what "dark as Egypt" meant. Down these streets our donkey-boy propelled the donkeys at full gallop. Commanding us to let go the reins, and flourishing his big stick, he ran behind us, yelling at the top of his lungs to all who valued their lives to get out of the way. How many fathers and mothers of families we ran over, in that headlong race, I cannot say. I know we did run over some, and were followed by deluges of Arabic curses, as we swept through the dark and narrow streets. But what possibility was there of resistance? what use of remonstrance? The donkey-boy was evidently out of his head. Spite of all our appeals to him, nothing could stop his yells and his slashing of the beasts, and we had to resign ourselves to a ride that seemed like the mythical gallop by the side of the Black Huntsman. The donkey-boy certainly did not make his appearance next day. Whether he ever survived his long run, and still preserved the use of his faculties after acting so like mad that night, has remained a most profound mystery until this very day.

But enough for Egypt. Two days after, we sailed from Alexandria in a steamer of the Austrian Lloyds. Another two days of windy weather brought us to Beyrout, where our journey in the Holy Land was to begin. Few cities of the world are more beautifully situated. The majestic mass of snow-crowned Lebanon was in full view, and the yellow houses of merchants and missionaries scattered among the groves and gardens, on the slopes of the bay, gave the town an air of unusual elegance and prosperity. The weather was delightfully warm, clear and bright, with comfortable nights and cloudless blue skies. On the flat roof of the hotel we walked up and down, in the moonlight evening, and laid our plans for the journey before us. Some delay was necessary before our arrangements were perfected. The first essential was to secure a good dragoman, for on the possession of a competent and experienced interpreter, steward and guide, all your comfort and security depend. We engaged a man at last who agreed to furnish horses, baggage-mules, tents, servants, cook, and all the requisites of a good living on the way. The contract was that he was to pay all expenses of every sort, taking us wherever we pleased to go, for an English pound a day for each person. There was a time when the traveler had to rough it in Palestine. Except at Beyrout, Jaffa, Jerusalem and Damascus, there are no such things as hotels. You must carry tents with you, and buy and cook your own provisions on the way. But modern science has reduced all this to a system. The dragoman surprises you with a set of beautifully embroidered and ornamented tents—a sleeping-tent, a dining-tent, and a cooking-tent. The first two are furnished with Persian carpets, and the sleeping-tent is provided with light iron bedsteads, mattresses and linen, camp-stools and all the ordinary apparatus for performing the toilet. You can have five courses for your dinner, got up by your French cook, if you desire it and are willing

to pay for it,—and so you may fare, though you camp in the desert. And you will have appetite enough to eat through all the five, if your experience is like mine. A ride of thirty miles on one of those Arab horses will give a keen relish when you sit down to dinner at seven o'clock in the evening. The horseback riding is indeed the great benefit to health, of a tour in Palestine. The horses may not be remarkable for beauty, but if they are of real Arab blood, they will show an amount of spirit and fire that will delight you. An Arab horse before starting may seem a tame and homely creature. After the start he seems to have changed his nature. At the least touch of the whip, he flies like the wind. Remember that there are no roads in Palestine. Mountain mule-tracks are the only approach to them. The Arab horse has never traveled except under the saddle,—the very sight of a wagon or carriage is so novel that it frightens him,—but his kindness and gentleness are beyond all praise. His step is proud and elastic, and he will go up and down places in those rocky mountain-paths where the rider holds his breath. Sharp-sighted and sure-footed, he will carry you ten hours a day, and look as well at the end of a month's journey as he did at the beginning.

It takes no long time to see the chief things of note in Palestine. We often form quite an erroneous notion of the extent of the Holy Land. A narrow region a hundred and fifty miles in length by fifty miles in breadth includes all the celebrated spots of sacred story. It is doubtful whether our Savior, during his public ministry, ever traversed an extent of territory as large as the State of Connecticut or New Hampshire. The whole of Palestine could be put between Rochester and Albany, and you would still have fifty miles to spare. From three or four elevations you can see the whole of it,—and, if there were any lofty mountain near the centre of the country, you could see the whole land from one single point of view. But, while Palestine is a small land, it is so situated as to be a meeting-place for other lands. The great caravan-route between Egypt and Assyria passed up her western coast and south of Lebanon through Damascus. In times of peace, Palestine was a thoroughfare for the traffic of the world; in times of war, the great heathen monarchies on either side of her contended for the possession of her territory, as a strategic point from which to conduct their military operations. So far from being true is the old notion that Palestine was a country chosen by God as a place of seclusion for his people,—it is rather true that it was a converging-point for the influences of civilization —a sort of highway of the nations.

I do not mean that every inhabitant of Palestine lived a public life, but I do mean that the land itself was so shaped at the beginning as to draw into it the currents of the world's trade—hence the wealth of Solomon and Hezekiah; so shaped as to give out religious and moral influence—hence the Hebrew culture of Alexandria and of Babylon. Palestine was a narrow land—and yet the only practicable and easy path for land-travel between the east and the west. Bounded on the west by the Great Sea, the modern Mediterranean, and on the east by the desolate table-lands of Bashan and Perea,—with the great mountain ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon at the north, and the Arabian desert at the south, it might at first seem as if it were a land separated from all other lands. But no, there were loop-holes through which trade could pass and did pass,—and through these

loop-holes ran the only practicable avenue for commerce. Jerusalem lay among the hills to the east of this traffic, and usually was not disturbed by it; but Jerusalem was too near not to feel its influence. No one can study the surroundings of Palestine in connection with its history, without being convinced that God formed the land at the creation, not only to be the theatre of a divine revelation, but also to be the centre from which that revelation should be disseminated through the world. God called Abraham out from among the heathen, and in this land educated him and his descendants to the belief in the divine unity, spirituality, and holiness, so that he might in this way be prepared to communicate the blessings of true religion to the whole earth. The interest we have in Palestine to-day is this, that it constitutes the school-house where the teachers of the world were taught; the stage upon which the mightiest scenes of human history were acted out; the presence-chamber where God revealed himself to patriarchs, kings and prophets; the sacred soil which Jesus' feet once trod, and on which the cross was erected for the redemption of mankind; the starting-point from which the apostles of the gospel of peace set forth for the conquest of the world.

How wonderfully fitted Palestine was for all these purposes of divine revelation, you can hardly realize till you travel over it from end to end. For it is not only a small land, and a meeting-place for other lands,— it is, besides, as Isaac Taylor has said, a sample-land of all lands. Every traveler can find the climate and scenery of his own country in Palestine. The Hebrew poet found near at hand the materials which the poet of other lands must seek by distant travel. Follow the course of the Jordan from the spot where it springs from the rocks, a full-grown river, until it empties into the Dead Sea, and you pass from the Arctic cold of Hermon's glaciers to the torrid heats of the plains of Jericho, where in summer it is hotter than in any other place on earth except Aden. There are mountain and plain, stream and forest, thunders and floods, lakes and flowers. The sun flares up from behind the mountain-wall of Edom, rejoicing as a bridegroom, and that same sun sets in the Great Sea. Surrounded with this wonderfully transparent air, and under the brightness of these stars, the writers of the Bible lived and thought and prayed. This wonderful variety of scenery and imagery renders the Bible intelligible and vivid in its descriptions to the inhabitants of all other lands. "Think," says the writer we have quoted, "what the Bible would be, if it had been written in Iceland," and how much of it would be impossible for us to understand,— and you will begin to admire the wisdom of God in selecting Palestine as the theatre for his revelation.

Our first route was along the shore of the Mediterranean, almost the whole length of the land to Jaffa, the ancient Joppa. Compared with the common route through the interior which we were afterwards to traverse, the ride was one of considerable sameness, and yet how strong and deep were the feelings which were called forth by the broken columns of Sidon and Tyre, of Cæsarea and Joppa! And then Mount Carmel by the sea, with the spot of Elijah's sacrifice, and Sarepta, a city of Sidon, where the prophet dwelt with the poor widow, and whither Christ himself once came. Our track lay along the very margin of the sea, so that now and then our horses'

hoofs were bathed in the foam of the Mediterranean waves. Then, for a number of miles, we would leave the smooth but dreary sand, and cut off some promontory by going inland. In climbing the Tyrian ladder, our horses carried us over a steep and frightful path cut in the edge of the rocky precipice where it projects over the sea, so that, while we stumbled up the giddy steps, the hoarse waves sounded from the rocky caverns beneath our feet. We generally succeeded in reaching a village by nightfall, and in finding a good camping-place in the vicinity. At Sidon we camped on the edge of a Mohammedan graveyard. By common report the graveyard was haunted by Ghouls. We heard jackals howling there all night with long and piteous cries. In the morning, dozens of Mohammedan women came to the grave, as Mary and Martha did of old, to weep there. And a mournful noise they made; though, after the weeping was concluded, they came over to the edge of our camp and gazed at our breakfast preparations for a half hour together. As we got further south, leaving Acca and Carmel behind us, our company was enlarged by the addition of two other parties, who joined us for safety. Our retinue was rather an imposing one. It consisted of twenty ladies and gentlemen, half a dozen dragomans and servants, and some sixty baggage-mules and horses. The coast here was swarming with Bedouin robbers, and the travel was as dangerous as in any part of Palestine. A merciless set they were. Only the day before our arrival, a German gentleman straying from his party was plundered and stripped by the Arabs, and reached the convent on Carmel entirely naked. The gentlemen of our party were almost all armed with revolvers, however, and we were quite equal to any attack.

The ruins of Cæsarea are the most extensive and striking of any in Palestine. The scene is one of perfect desolation. Not a house or hut exists within miles of the place. The remains of the ancient city are colossal. Immense fragments of the old mole, into which are built splendid granite columns of earlier edifices, lie heaped one upon another, while the shore is strewn with a wreck of marble pillars and massive walls. Cæsarea is full of interest, even in its utter solitude. Here lived Cornelius, and here first the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the Gentiles. Here Herod met his terrible death, in the city which he deemed the most splendid monument of his greatness. Here Paul was imprisoned two long years, made his noble defense before Felix and Agrippa, and from this very port he set out on his eventful voyage to Rome. The wild flowers are growing now amid the ruins of Cæsarea's temples, the waves are dashing over the remains of its ancient wealth and glory, and Paul and his judges have long, long ago been summoned before another and a grander tribunal.

So we passed on to Jaffa, the ancient Joppa, and the next day we climbed the steep, rugged, barren road that leads up and up to the summit of the great rocky water-shed of Palestine, and then over its crest to Jerusalem, the Holy City. No one who has not seen Palestine with his own eyes can comprehend the excessively mountainous character of the country. There are only a few square miles of level land from one end of it to the other. Everlasting masses of yellow limestone hills succeed one another as you go, for the most part devoid of all appearance of greenness or beauty, except where here and there you light upon a lot of straggling gray olive trees. After a

long ride under a hot sun, the approach to any city would have roused our enthusiasm, but what shall I say of the approach to Jerusalem? It will live in memory, as long as memory lasts. In our anxiety to catch the first glimpse of the Holy City, we had pushed our horses on far ahead of the baggage-mules, and one or two of us, more eager than the rest, and unable any longer to endure a slow trot, galloped on alone to the last ridge which separated us from the city to which so many for ages have made pilgrimage. A moment more and the domes and minarets and battlemented walls of Jerusalem lay before us, and beyond, the long yellow mass of the Mount of Olives, dotted here and there with the trees from which it takes its name. One has not from this side the finest or even a fine view of the city, and yet the feelings with which we approached it were not renewed in their freshness and fullness when we gazed on it afterwards, from other points of view. Even here, as we saw the hills that shut it in on every side, it was easy to feel the force of David's words: "As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about his people." Zion and Moriah, the western and eastern mounts on which the city is built, and the dome of the Mosque of Omar, which stands on the site of the ancient temple, were all clearly visible, and over walls and ramparts and towers, as well as over the whole city enclosed within them, lay a warm, golden sunshine, so silent and calm that, as we looked down upon it from a distance, it almost seemed deserted, like a city of the dead. Imagination was busy, however, and it was easy to picture it out in its ancient magnificence, as it was when he, whose feet trod these very paths, lived and taught within it.

The sublime and the ridiculous lie very close together. Our meditations were disturbed by the performances of a crowd of pilgrims near us. They too had pressed on to catch the first glimpse of the Holy City. They were a curious set — men, women and children. Every man had a donkey, but not every man rode his beast. This seemed reserved for the women and children. And the method of loading the animals was curious. Over the back of the creature was slung what looked like an enormous pair of saddle-bags. In one side the wife and mother curled herself up, while half a dozen children, more or less, big or little, were thrown in on the other side, as a makeweight to balance her. Imagine the scene, when every man, woman and child was alive with excitement, and each wanted to be first in bowing the knees at first sight of the city, and crying out "El Khuds! El Khuds!" "the Holy, the Holy!" Such a tumbling head over heels out of saddle-bags, and such an indiscriminate mess of children, women, men and donkeys, alas! I shall never see again. And what had all these pilgrims come for? Most of them had come to spend Holy Week, and to attend the ceremonies in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. What these were, we understood better a few days afterwards, when we witnessed them ourselves. On the evening of Good Friday, the church was filled with an ignorant and fanatical crowd, whom even the guard of Turkish soldiers could scarcely keep in order. An image of the Savior, half the size of life, a shriveled, shrunken, puny figure of wax, was nailed to a cross, exposed, carried in procession, taken from the cross, anointed and laid in the sepulchre, in presence of a dense multitude of noisy fanatics, who worshiped it as a fetich is worshiped in the south of Africa. The whole performance was a sickening one, and all that was

impressive about it was the singing of a company of monks and the responses of a choir of boys. It was the grand, solemn chant of an Italian composer, the pathos of which not even the grating voices nor the stupid indifference of the singers could entirely obscure.

One soon gets enough of holy places at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Most of them are evidently mere figments of the imagination. It was more convenient for the monks who showed them to have them close together, and so, they have put them close together. It was better for their pockets to have many of them for which to charge an admission-fee, and so, many of them were invented. They not only show the sepulchre where Christ was laid, but the spot of the Crucifixion and the holes in the rock into which the three crosses were thrust that day. And yet the whole Chapel where these are shown is an upper chamber, standing on no rock at all! A little further on you see the Chapel of Adam, where the monks say his skull first leaped out of the earth; then the tomb of Melchisedek; and again, the very spot where the cock stood when he crowed to Peter. A little experience in the hands of the monks convinces you that the less confidence you put in their stories, the more apt you will be to learn the truth. Our religion gives little heed to special places, and it is a merciful ordering of God that none of the spots where the great events of Jesus' life occurred can be certainly identified, for the history of Palestine abundantly demonstrates that, if they could be certainly identified, they would just as certainly be the objects of idolatrous worship. The object of a journey to Palestine is not to identify these sites, but rather to fix in mind the general features of the land and the character of its scenery. The hills about Jerusalem, and those on which the city is built, remain just as they were, and though there is at first a feeling of disappointment at the wretchedness and misery that now meet your eye on every side, and especially at the lying and superstition of those who inhabit this once favored land, still the great events of Scripture all fit wonderfully into the scenes before your eyes, and you leave the country more thoroughly convinced of the truth of the Bible, and with far more vivid conceptions of its narratives, than you could possibly have had before you came.

After a few days' sojourn in the City, we went through the Wilderness of Judea to the Jordan and the Dead Sea. The hills and valleys where John preached and Christ was tempted are melancholy wastes. Scarcely a blade of grass grows upon them, and the bronze-colored mountain-sides reflect upon you with tenfold heat the rays of a burning sun. Down, down we went, a long and desolate ride, till we stood by the ruins of Jericho, and drank of the brook which the prophet healed. There we encamped for the night, near a large party of pilgrims who had come to wash in the Jordan. Long before light next morning we set off for the river, and an hour after our arrival at the narrow, rushing stream, the pilgrims came trooping after us. Then followed a scene that baffles all description. Men, women and children, draped and undraped, rushed to the water to plunge themselves three times beneath the surface. Many were clad in the grave-clothes which they had purchased long before the time, and had come to consecrate by a wetting in the Jordan. Fathers ducked their wives and children, while the wives shrieked fearfully and the children yelled. All was excitement and confusion, and a source of no small amusement to the *howadji* who was

looking on. By and by the sun rose, and we pushed on over the level, sandy plain to the Dead Sea. The landscape about it was deathlike. The sea was motionless. Complete silence reigned. Not a living thing, beast or bird or fish, was visible. The mountains rose steep, bare and yellow, from both sides, and when the sun got high, the whole region was hot as a furnace. The water was more bitter and disgusting to the taste than one can previously conceive. Sea-water is very palatable compared with it. On the shore we sat down and breakfasted, after six hours riding, and then prepared to ascend the mountains to Mar Saba, on our way back to Jerusalem.

All that day we rode under a scorching sun, over a succession of yellow hills, whose leafless desolation was like death itself — a horrible country. Bare cliffs of rock alternated with rounded hills, covered thick with yellow stones. No sign of water or life — not a blade of grass, not a breath of air, — only a stagnant atmosphere seven times heated. Our horses grew faint, and we grew sick, long before we reached our camping-place. Yet all day long our Arab guards seemed strangely frightened. Now and then we saw straggling Bedouin posted on the heights above our road, and these, they told us, were spies. We saw no cause for alarm, however, until after we reached our camping-place at the bottom of a deep valley, and dusk came on. Then we saw numbers of Bedouin horsemen filing along on the edges of the hills far above us. Our muleteers had taken off the horses and mules to a spring, some distance up the side of one of the hills, in order to give them water. Suddenly, as evening came on, we heard numerous reports of guns in that direction, and saw frequent flashes through the darkness. A man comes flying to the camp with the intelligence that a large party of Bedouin have seized upon our mules and horses, and have run away with them to the mountains. The men-servants catch up all the arms they can lay hands on, and rush off up the hill to help their comrades. The gentlemen are requested to get their pistols ready in case of emergency. Soon flashes and reports again on the hills — here a flash and there a flash, bang! bang! — till the hill-side seems to be the scene of quite a battle. All of a sudden our dragoman gallops into the camp in a state of the wildest excitement, exclaiming that the Bedouin have beaten our muleteers, and that there is great danger of their making a descent upon us in the camp. "Ladies to the tents!" and in an instant, having obtained a supply of ammunition, our heroic commander gallops off again into the darkness. The half dozen ladies crouch together in one of the tents, in no very peaceful state of mind, while the gentlemen of the party exert themselves to calm them, and at the same time load all the guns and revolvers within reach. While this is going on, one of them shoots himself accidentally through the hand. Then the ladies in the presence of real suffering come to their senses, and, while the doctor extracts the ball, they lend all their aid and sympathy. A muleteer comes in with his head broken in with a stone, another with his hand fractured, another with a wound in his arm. The scene by this time becomes sufficiently exciting. The firing on the hills has not ceased, but it is not so frequent. A messenger soon comes to tell us that our men have fought most bravely, have recovered the animals, and are now leading them back in safety to the camp. Nobody is killed, though some are slightly injured.

It seems amusing to look back upon, and yet I should hardly care to pass that night again. No one knew that the Bedouin would not come down upon us in the darkness. No one could be certain that in their anger they would not fire into our tents from the rocks above us. Yet we stationed a strong guard, and all of us slept soundly. No attack was made, and we rose in the morning very thankful that all was safe. For several hours after starting from the night's camping ground we saw companies of Bedouin posted on the tops of the hills about us, but they did not dare to attack us. They looked ugly enough, however, with their Arab horses and their long guns. They were greatly superior to us in numbers, and, if they had been only a little less afraid of Frank arms, we might have had more trouble. As it was, their caution was very well advised, for we all had revolvers, and their long match-locks would have been almost worthless in a combat with foreigners. All this country through which we passed before we reached Jerusalem again is celebrated for the robberies and murders which have been perpetrated by the lawless Bedouin. In fact it has an ancient reputation of this sort, for it was this very wilderness of Judea that the man whom the good Samaritan relieved, passed through, when he went down to Jericho and fell among thieves.

On our way back to Jerusalem we visited Bethlehem. It is pleasant to find such places as Bethlehem and Nazareth, so far superior to the ordinary eastern towns in cleanliness and decency. The inhabitants of both are almost all Christians, and both are distinguished in Syria for the beauty of the women. The grotto of the nativity at Bethlehem, with its golden lamps and silken hangings, did not interest me half so much as the sight of the hillsides where David tended his father's flocks, and the shepherds saw the multitude of the heavenly host on the night that Christ was born. The grotto is probably an imposture, but the hills and valleys about are the same that we read of in most ancient story. That same evening we made our way northward, past the spot where Rachel died, and where her tomb now stands, until the Holy City lay spread out before us on the opposite heights, and we felt the truth of the Psalmist's words, "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion, on the sides of the north, the city of the great King." Down the deep vale of Hinnom, and through the Valley of Jehoshaphat,— until we crossed over and pitched our tents for the night upon the Mount of Olives.

Memorable evening! It was the Mohammedan feast of Ramadan, and at the firing of the sunset gun, circlets of lamps were lit, upon the minarets of all the mosques, that shone through the growing darkness like crowns of glory. Beneath our feet was the sacred city,— where David reigned, and where Jesus taught. Somewhere in this lowly valley the Savior passed that last most bitter night of agony in the garden,— up that steep path he was taken to his trial,— on one of those mounds outside the walls he hung those six long hours, parched with thirst and quivering with intensest pain, under the blazing noon-day sun. Who could lie down to sleep without most solemn and grateful thoughts that night? And when the morning dawned and all the splendor of the great temple enclosure dawned upon us, who could help being half intoxicated with the imaginations of the hour? There, across the valley, was the place where the cloud of glory descended upon the temple, and Solomon dedicated to God the courts of the house of the Lord. The

great open area of these courts now occupies a space of fifteen hundred feet in length by a thousand feet in breadth, and contains thirty-four acres. The temple of God has given place to a Mohammedan mosque, but the broad courts are beautiful still. The massive and lofty walls, the mosaic pavements, alternating with plots of fresh, green grass, the dark olives, the tapering cypresses, the marble fountains, the broad, elevated platform encircled by airy arches, the richly carved pulpits and prayer-niches and miniature cupolas, the great mosque with its noble dome glittering with enameled tiles, in arabesques of rainbow-hues, the secluded, sacred air that seemed to belong to all, the white figures of veiled women stealing from one mass of foliage to another, the turbaned heads bowed low in prayer,—all this was deeply impressive. But what must it have been, when these enclosing walls were hid by triple rows of marble columns a hundred and twenty feet in height and a thousand feet in length, forming arched colonnades grander than those of the grandest cathedral of modern days! What must it have been when, in place of this mosque, stood the magnificent structure of the temple, with its lofty portico towering above all the rest! What must it have been, when a hundred thousand worshipers joined in the solemn chants of the sanctuary—a multitude whose voice was like the sound of many waters, and which furnished John in the Apocalypse with his imagery, when he described the worship of the temple on high! Ah, Jerusalem is beautiful, but the beauty of the past has gone forever. Only in the heavenly Jerusalem, and in the song of the multitude that no man can number, will it ever be restored.

But time would fail me to tell the whole. Jerusalem must be left behind us. Northward, past Mizpeh and Gibeon, through Bethel and Shiloh, to Jacob's well, and Sychar, a city of Samaria. Here, at the foot of Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim, and between them both, we passed a quiet Sabbath day. We joined in worship with a number of parties encamped near us. Before we left the place, we visited the small, plain, white-washed chamber which constitutes the Samaritan Synagogue, and gazed from a respectful distance upon the great roll containing the precious Samaritan Pentateuch, which, though not written, as they relate, by the grandson or great-grandson of Aaron, may yet date back to the beginning of the Christian era. Then we clambered to the top of Gerizim, and inspected the pit and the stones where the passover-lambs are killed and roasted every spring, and where twelve men, in white surplices and turbans, representing the twelve tribes of Israel, still from year to year maintain the ancestral Samaritan worship. Then, descending, we made our way northward, by way of Samaria and Dothan, to Jezreel and Shunem, Nain and Endor, all situated at the east of that great plain of Megiddo or Esdraelon, which we saw three weeks before, in all its grandeur and desolation, from Mount Carmel. Thence we climbed the hill and stood in Nazareth, the scene of thirty years of Jesus' life.

The appearance of the little town is very pleasing, with its dazzling white walls embosomed in a green framework of cactus-hedges, and of fig and olive trees. The House of the Virgin we were not able to see, because, as tradition relates, the sacred dwelling was carried off in the thirteenth century by angels, in order to prevent its desecration by the Moslems. This may be regarded as authentic, for during the Pontificate of Paul II, that infallible head of the Church, this miracle was solemnly confirmed and vouched for by the Papal See. For reasons which may be imagined as well as they can

be described, we neglected to visit the workshop of Joseph, although the sight was offered us at so low a price as three piastres. But two things we did see which were much better worth seeing,—first, the spring outside the village, with its many maidens drawing water, much as Laban's daughters did of old; and, secondly, the hill to the southwest of the town which, from a height of eighteen hundred feet, commands a lovely view of the vale of Nazareth, together with the distant prospect of Carmel and the great, wide sea beyond. To this spring where the women gathered, Mary the Virgin must have often led the steps of her infant Son, and from that summit the youthful Jesus must often have looked off toward the horizon which marked for him the farthest limit of the visible world, while he pondered upon the work for the world's deliverance, which even then began to spread out like this grand panorama before him.

From Nazareth we passed on to Mount Tabor and the Lake of Galilee, and past the ruins of the cities on which the curse of Jesus rested because they repented not. Then to Safed, Cæsarea-Philippi, and Damascus. And with Damascus we must close our journey. It is a fitting close. The famous view of Damascus, from the ridge north of the city, has been celebrated by every traveler, yet it has never been praised enough. It is the most beautiful vision that strikes the eye of the traveler in the east. The plain of Damascus is covered with foliage, as far as the eye can reach. The endless orchards of fig, pomegranate, mulberry, almond, apricot, orange and olive, form an unbroken sea of green, that surrounds the city and washes its very walls. The minarets and domes of Damascus rise in slender and swelling beauty from the midst of the green, and no language can do justice to the exquisite contrast between the white spires and the verdure that surrounds them. This plain of waving leaves is bounded by high and barren mountains. The snowy crest of goodly Hermon, and its subject hills, fill all the north and west. It is a legend of the Moslems that Mohammed, the prophet, never entered Damascus, exclaiming as he passed by, "Man can have but one Paradise,—I will not take mine on earth." Alas, that the beauty of the outside show is so belied by squalor and wretchedness within! But so it is with all the land of Palestine. The prospect often pleases,—and only man is vile. Neither Damascus nor Jerusalem can satisfy. And there was no lesson that I learned in the Holy Land, more impressive and lasting than this: There is no earthly city, however famed in story or sacred from associations of the past, where the soul can rest and say, Here I will abide, here I will dwell forever. If we would find rest, it must be, not in the earthly but in the heavenly Canaan, not in the Holy City where prophets spake and Jesus walked while here in mortal flesh, but only in that city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. It was only this common feeling of us all that the old mediæval poet expressed, in those most sweet and sacred lines:

"O, mother dear, Jerusalem!
When shall I come to thee?
When shall my sorrows have an end?
Thy joys when shall I see?

"O, happy harbor of God's saints!
O, sweet and pleasant soil!
In thee no sorrow can be found,
Nor grief, nor pain, nor toil!"

XLVII.

THE CRUSADES.*

The subject of this paper illustrates the powerful effects of the law of association. Important events invest the spots where they occur with a peculiar sacredness. This is true not only in individual experience, but in general history. The principle has special application to religion. Every great religion has attracted popular devotion to its birthplace or its shrines, its ritual or its pilgrimages. Even Christianity is not without its holy places; for the very reason that it is a historical religion, as distinguished from a system of priestly ceremonial or of abstract doctrine, it bestows upon these holy places a genuine and a reasonable regard; the places are helps to its influence and verifications of its truth. The Jew looked with affection to the city where David built his capital upon the rugged heights of Zion, and the Christian looks with an equal though a different interest to that other hill where the Son of David was crucified and buried.

Christianity, however, differs from other religions, in that it is pre-eminently the religion of the Spirit. It accepts the help of the outward and visible so far as these can minister to inward devotion, but it counts these idolatry when they usurp the thought and worship that belong to God. It has felt at every step of its history the common tendency of human nature to exalt the means above the end, the form above the substance. And there have been whole generations in which the religion of Christendom, so-called, has well-nigh fallen back to the plane of the earthly and material. There were two hundred years of the middle age, when the church forgot her living Lord in her jealousy for the possession of his sepulchre. As Hegel has well expressed it in his Philosophy of History, "She sought the truth of spirit in a tomb; she was met by the old words: Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here but is risen!" This mighty movement and culmination of an externalized Christianity we call the Crusades. My purpose is briefly to review the occasions, causes and results of the Crusades, with special reference to ecclesiastical history and to European civilization.

In the eleventh century pilgrimage was a thing of ancient date. It had begun even under the heathen emperors. Though Titus had burned the temple at Jerusalem and drawn the ploughshare over its ashes, and though Hadrian had founded a pagan colony on Mount Zion and built a temple to Venus on the hill of Calvary, Christians even thus early found their way to the Holy City. The conversion of Constantine, and the royal progress of Helena, the mother of the emperor, with the breaking down of heathen

*An Essay read before The Club, Rochester, February 15, 1876.

altars and the discovery of the Savior's tomb which followed, rendered pilgrimage both common and fashionable. Constantine erected the church of the Holy Sepulchre; his mother marked the path of her pilgrimage by the churches which she built; it is only a natural result that we should possess, from a date so far back as the fourth century, an itinerary designed for the use of pilgrims from Bordeaux, by way of Constantinople, to Jerusalem.

The more sagacious and spiritual Fathers of the church, such as Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine and Jerome, protested against these pilgrimages as needless and dangerous. But the tide soon became too strong for resistance. The number who set out for the east continually increased. Hospitals were founded for the refreshment and care of the pilgrims. They were exempted from tolls and taxes. The staff and wallet, the scallop-shell upon the hat, from the shore of the Mediterranean, and the palm-branch from Jericho in the hand, became insignia of a lower order of nobility, to which the poor as well as the rich might aspire. Not only were there rewards at the hands of men. The journey to Palestine became a work of merit which availed with God. In connection with the growing faith in works of supererogation, thousands persuaded themselves that bathing in the Jordan was a baptism which washed away all sins, and that the shirt in which they entered the Holy City, if only preserved for a winding-sheet, would in the last great day ensure them a blessed resurrection.

In the year 637, only five years after Mohammed's death, the wave of Saracenic invasion under the Caliph Omar swept over Syria and Egypt, and for a century thereafter it rolled onward almost without a check. But almost the last great act of the undivided Roman Empire was the repulse of the Moslems from Constantinople in 718 by sturdy Leo, the Emperor of the East. But for this staggering blow, and that other crushing defeat which they suffered at the hands of Charles Martel a little later at Tours (732), the Saracens might have descended upon Christendom while her social and governmental institutions were yet unformed, and we might be the heirs of an Asiatic instead of a European civilization. When the empire was actually divided, and Charlemagne united the western lands, the crisis of Saracen fury and ambition had passed. Pilgrimage to Jerusalem, not wholly interrupted by the recent wars, began anew and with redoubled enthusiasm. The very hazards of an expedition to a foreign land and among the infidels stimulated the imagination. The holy places of the Christian were holy places of the Moslem also. Though hatred of the western image-worship was difficult to conceal, Saracen thrift seemed to get the better of Saracen bigotry. Or, did the Moslems learn courtesy from their Caliph Haroun al Raschid, who assured all Franks of safety, and in token thereof sent to Charlemagne the keys of the church of the Holy Sepulchre? Whatever may be the explanation, it is certain that the great Charles helped on the growing tendency of the times by proclaiming in the eighth century that throughout his whole realm pilgrims to Palestine should be gratuitously provided for, at least to the extent of lodging, fire and water.

No proper estimate of the events that followed can be formed, without taking into account the traditional hold which pilgrimage had come to have upon people of every class, the almost unobstructed freedom of it from the first to the tenth centuries, and the sacrilege which seemed involved in

every attempt to prevent or hinder it. There were indeed occasional outbursts of Saracen insolence from the time of the Fatimite Caliphs, descendants of Fatima, daughter and only child of Mohammed, in 972. But it was not until 1063 that the real persecution of pilgrims began. In that year the Seljuks — for the Turks proper did not appear until the thirteenth century — pressed down upon the empire of the Saracens, as the Teutonic tribes had pressed down upon old Rome,— though Findlay tells us that they did not take Jerusalem till 1076. They were half heathen and utterly barbarous. They had embraced Mohammedanism in its bigotry and its warlike spirit, but they had not yet imbibed the Mohammedan civilization. In one vast horde they poured in from the east and north, overran all Palestine, put an end to the Saracen dominion in Syria, and threatened the very existence of the Eastern Empire at Constantinople. They scorned the Christians, whom they knew only from the degraded Syrians and Greeks, and from the dust-stained pilgrims who thronged the roads to Jerusalem. Then came the first real and protracted suffering. The unsettled and despotic nature of the Turkish rule, the barbarity of Turkish manners, the extortions, robberies and outrages perpetrated either by fanatical zeal or by native cruelty upon Christians of both sexes and of every European land, were deeper wrongs than had been suffered by the church since the persecutions of the Pagan Emperors. These were the more intolerable and roused the deeper indignation throughout the west, from the fact that the idea of the outward unity of the church, and its supreme authority over all earthly powers, had nearly reached its final height,— or, to put it in fewer words, it was the time of the great Hildebrand, known to history as Pope Gregory the Seventh.

Yet Hildebrand was not the leader of the movement which followed. Let us appreciate his position. He did not underestimate the danger of this new onset of barbarism. The swift advances of the Turkish power excited his grave apprehensions. Nor was the project of a united movement against the infidels a new one to him. A century before, the indignities put upon pilgrims by the Fatimite Caliphs had led Gerbert, Archbishop of Ravenna, to write an address in the name of the church of Jerusalem, exhorting all Christians to take arms for its rescue. Even thus early the Pisans had sent out a fleet and had invaded Syria with such effect that, for a little time, the Saracens supposed all Christendom was arming against them. And now the Byzantine emperor, fearing an attack of the Turks upon his capital, sent an embassy to Gregory, entreating his assistance. Gregory entered into the plan. With the two-fold aim of driving back the Turks and of bringing the Eastern Empire into the Latin fold, he addressed the rulers of the European states, urging a common war upon the Turks, and foreshadowing the Crusades. He showed that the Eastern Empire was but a feeble barrier against the infidel and barbarian enemy, and that if the west did not go to the east, the east would come to the west.

But the civil powers of Europe had learned to be suspicious of Gregory's uncompromising logic. They feared that the rousing of Europe against Asia might be only another scheme for enlarging and centralizing the papal power. They refused to second his plans, and thus in all probability was prevented that complete swallowing up of Europe in the Papacy, which would have resulted if the Crusades had been under the control of the great

Hildebrand. Great revolutions break out from below. Rulers may guide them; they cannot originate them; they can seldom precipitate them. And Gregory found it so. Though the struggle with regard to the investitures was over, and Henry the Fourth had done his three days penance in the winter's cold at Gregory's gate, and the Holy Roman Empire had well-nigh yielded its claim of independent sovereignty to the Holy Roman Church, yet all the power of the Pope was inadequate to the stirring up of practical interest in the proposed undertaking — a practical interest which, when kindled twenty years later among the people, swept over all Europe like a prairie-fire in the drought of summer.

Thus forty years passed after the Seljuk conquest of Palestine, before any general effort was made to rescue Christ's sepulchre from the infidels, or to renew the conflict between two great religions, which had ceased four centuries before. But, during those forty years, every city and castle in Europe had received back its maltreated pilgrims, some of them maimed and just escaped with life, and all of them narrating their sufferings with the fervor of personal experience. In the preaching of these pilgrims we must find the immediate occasion of the Crusades. Foremost among them was Peter of Picardy. A youth of fiery spirit, he had been bred to the profession of arms. But he left the sword for the crucifix, and a high-born wife for what in less stirring times might have been called a passionless bride, the Church. In a secluded hermitage he buried himself from the world. Self-mortification and intense meditation wrought their natural effects upon an ardent and imaginative nature. Christ himself, as he believed, appeared to him in visions. He talked familiarly with the holy apostles. A letter from heaven fell at his feet. He made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and, yet more aroused by the sufferings and outrages which he observed and experienced, he solemnly announced to the Patriarch of Jerusalem that he was commissioned by God to rouse the western nations to drive out the infidel oppressors.

Returning to Europe, Peter brought letters from the Patriarch to Urban II, the successor and imitator of Hildebrand. His recitals were received with tears. His general scheme was sanctioned, and he was sent, as special envoy of the Papal See, to preach the deliverance of the Holy Land through all the countries of Europe. Urban seconded his efforts with the utmost vigor. The Council of Piacenza united the Italians; the Council of Clermont, in France, united the Transalpine peoples. At this latter gathering, after the Byzantine ambassadors had pleaded their country's cause and Peter had electrified the people by his eloquence, the Pope himself addressed the multitude. As he spoke, the thirty thousand laymen followed his adjurations with the shout, "Deus vult!"—and "Deus vult!" became the watchword of the holy wars. Each bishop hastened from the Council to his diocese, and roused his flock. Thus the cry "Deus vult!" spread from Clermont, in Auvergne, to every quarter of Europe, and, seized with sudden frenzy, all other business neglected, men of every nation and of every class sewed red crosses upon their shoulders and took arms to deliver Jerusalem. And so, in the years 1096 and 1097, the first Crusade began.

It would be impossible to give even a meagre sketch of the incidents and actors in these wars. And general description here is more intelligible and

impressive than detail. To tell the story in few words, six millions of all classes, first and last, assumed the cross and vowed to go to Palestine. According to contemporary writers, six hundred thousand perished in the first Crusade, and historians variously estimate that from two millions to four millions was the total loss of life in the long conflict. And even the largest of these numbers will not seem impossible, when we consider how these worse than useless hosts were composed. Some of the armies comprised the very offscouring of Europe — very savages for ignorance and vice. The three hundred thousand whom the more shrewd leaders sent out under Peter the Hermit, asked, in their simplicity, if the nearest village to their homes were Jesusalem, the end of their wanderings. The northern forests sent forth hordes whom the Arabian chroniclers call an iron race, of gigantic stature, who darted fire from their eyes and spat blood upon the ground. Alas, that all were not such as the Arabian chronicles described! It was sacrilege to deter any from so holy a service. Women enlisted, and from the Rhine came a troop of Amazons under "the golden-footed dame." A regiment of boys, armed with cross-bows, made show of fight at Antioch. There was a Crusade of the Children, and thousands of weaklings who should have been in mothers' arms, after crossing the Alps in the depths of winter, were either shipwrecked in the Mediterranean or captured and sold for slaves. Thus the armies were a heterogeneous conglomeration of all races, languages, sexes and ages, without unity of plan or discipline or generalship. It is no wonder that they whitened every road to Palestine with their skeletons, and drenched the Holy Land with their blood.

Yet there were great leaders — men valiant themselves, and able so to marshal their few brave and disciplined followers, as to rout and overthrow twenty times their number of Paynim foes. The magnanimous Godfrey; the impetuous Robert, son of William the Conqueror; the cool and ambitious Bohemond; Tancred, the hero of Tasso's epic; the lion-hearted Richard of England, whose restless spirit of adventure Scott has so well described in Ivanhoe; Saint Louis, the best of all the kings of France; and Frederick Barbarossa, the earliest and noblest model of chivalry, as he is the greatest of the crusaders — all these were mighty captains during the two centuries. Godfrey captured Jerusalem and built up a frost-work kingdom. Frederick II, the grandson of Frederick Barbarossa, excommunicated though he was, put the same crown upon his head in the next century. Baldwin seated himself upon the throne of the old capital of Constantine. A few got glory, but the best of them won only disease and death.

And yet these expeditions did not die out upon experience of the first disasters. From the same defeats seemed to rise the same enthusiasm. Generation after generation took the sword to perish in the same way. The eight Crusades were only more marked instances of what occurred every year of the two crusading centuries. Every summer saw its armed bands set out for Palestine,— priests and people blessing them as they departed from their homes, and accompanying them a little distance on their way. The great Crusades were but exaggerations of these annual expeditions, occasioned by some great calamity at home which demanded penance, or some great reverse abroad which necessitated reinforcements. And so the West was kept in continual commotion, from the first Crusade, when, in the words of the

eastern princess, all Europe seemed loosed from its foundations and hurled upon Asia, to the last Crusade, when the good King Louis — Louis IX, of France — after wearing the red-cross for twenty years, died of the pestilence in Africa. Yet long before these two centuries, with their migration of nations, had expired, the Christians were driven from every Syrian stronghold, the two kingdoms they had founded were annihilated, and the Turks held again in peace the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. And thus the only enterprise in which all the western states engaged with equal ardor — an enterprise which was certainly the heroic event of modern Europe, uniting its various peoples into one, as did the siege of Troy the Greeks — an enterprise, too, in which Europe was first known as Europe, and in which European states first appeared as single states in history — this enterprise, in its immediate aim and conduct, must certainly be regarded as the most signal monument of human folly that has appeared in any age of human history. With Voltaire, we may call it a joint product of barbarism, ignorance and fanaticism. With Milman, we may describe it as the most wonderful phrensy that ever possessed mankind.

But it does not become us to rest content with an estimate like this. Such an estimate regards the vast movement only in its superficial aspects. Considered in the higher light of a necessary result and outlet of imprisoned forces, which were then exercised and improved for worthier tasks than the building up of Syrian kingdoms or the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre, the Crusades are instinct with new principles and pregnant with consequences the most beneficent and sublime. Let us carefully distinguish between the causes of these wars, and their mere occasions or concomitants. It is very plain that the preaching of Peter the Hermit was in no proper sense the cause of the Crusades. The real cause was that hidden train that had been silently laid in the mind of Europe, and whose very existence was unknown until Peter's words put to it the torch. The kings of Europe were not the cause of the Crusades. They took no share in the first Crusade. They followed the great popular impulse, only when they found it irresistible. The leaders of the hosts were not the cause of the Crusades. They did not at first originate them, nor could they stop the movement when it had once begun, — for it had a deeper root than the wish to gain the kingdoms for Christians leaders, or to gratify the fantastic and adventurous whims of princes. It was like the rising of an ocean-flood, spontaneous, overwhelming, either bearing all obstacles upon its bosom or drowning them forever. From the beginning to the end the Crusades were essentially popular in their character; and they demonstrate, if demonstration were needed, that the millions are moved, not by climate, not by government, not by individual leaders, not by material interests, but primarily by ideas, and that, for an idea, a whole nation or a whole hemisphere may live and die. There was as idea that possessed the mind of Europe, and that explains the Crusades. Can history, or the philosophy of history, compel this subtle but mighty spirit to take form before us and announce its name?

Guizot has reduced the various influences which determined the Crusades to two great classes, the social and the moral. He claims that the social cause was the old barbarian taste for roving and for war, which, although confined for three centuries since the Empire of Charlemagne, had never

been extinguished. When the Empire which Charlemagne had founded was divided and scattered, in the hands of his successors, all the old restlessness revived. The barbaric spirit awoke from its lethargy. There came again a chaos of confusion and isolation. The military ambition, the haughty independence, the uncurbed license, the private wars of the barons, began anew. The open country was the scene of disorder and outrage. The only pursuits of the noble of that day were war and rapine. He was the same old pagan under a Christian guise. Sprinkling him with a holy broom had not altered his nature. When he was asked to fight in a foreign land for the tomb of Christ, the call appealed alike to his instinct of wandering and his instinct of battle. The sacrifices which his fathers had offered to Thor or to Woden seemed to him most proper to lay upon God's altar. The slaughter of the enemies of the faith in the distant East became the natural object of his religious zeal.

Let us remember, also, that the individualism of mediæval society was almost perfect. The feudal system fostered it. And feudalism was the union of the old Roman grants of land upon condition of military service, with the Teutonic fealty of the individual warrior to the leader whose fortunes he followed. But as yet the personal and Teutonic element was in the ascendant. There were a host of petty chiefs, each with his body of armed retainers, his castle and the huts of his vassals around it. The servant imitated the master. Only by valor could he rise. And war was needed, as the opportunity for valor. In war man was opposed to man, strength to strength. Gunpowder had not yet rendered personal prowess and might of arm of inferior account. Courage met its reward; the squire might win knighthood of his master, and the knight might win an eastern principality.

For such habits of life, and for such warlike passions, what a field was opened on the plains of Asia! What California was to the broken-down merchant of a quarter of a century ago, what Dante's terrestrial paradise at the antipodes of Jerusalem was to Christopher Columbus on his two last voyages westward, that Jerusalem itself was to the Crusader — a city where fallen fortunes might be raised again, or where ambition might carve its way to fabulous wealth and power. The knight need cramp his energies no longer in petty castle-warfare. His sphere of action widened boundlessly before him. Golden sceptres glittered in the distance. Diamonds and palaces, the spoils of Turkish Emirs, Grecian wines and women, tempted his curiosity and roused his imagination. Many a mind had visions by night and day of palaces of cedar, paved with jasper and lined with gold. Every class of society felt the charm. The monk might escape the discipline of the convent, and as a member of the Church militant yield himself again to the pleasures of the world. The oppressed serf or citizen might gain freedom from the tyrannical restrictions of his lord. To join a Crusade, the vassal might alienate his land without consent of his superior, and enjoy all the privileges of the ecclesiastic. The debtor might escape from his creditors, the outlaw brave the law, yet be free from punishment, not only for all past, but for all future transgressions. Guy of Lusignan fled from France a murderer, and was raised to the throne of Jerusalem.

Yet it is evident that all these social influences were only of secondary account. They acted with energy only after the spread of some common

idea, which could unite them with itself and take a coloring from them. Such narrow and selfish interests alone could never have roused or united Europe. The love of war and the barbaric desire of roving cannot be said to have inspired all the European classes. This cause was most potent among the feudal nobility. Over vast multitudes it had but little influence. The serfs, the artisans, monks, citizens, women and youth, in fact, all the more timid and peaceful classes, were impelled by a far different desire, were animated by a feeling which passed the bounds of ordinary selfishness, and proceeded from deeper springs than the love of war and the curiosity of the traveler. A mere glance at the composition of the hosts that perished on every Hungarian road and on every Turkish plain puts this beyond all doubt. We are driven to the conclusion that, underlying all private interests and all social influences, there was a moral or religious cause, and it is only when we recognize this, that we can account for the marvelous facts of the history.

This cause was not by any means the papal influence. This is evident from the fact already alluded to, that even Gregory the Great, a pope of vastly more ability than Urban, was utterly unable to rouse the European princes, the very class over whom the social inducements had greatest power, although he summoned them to arms at the very crisis of danger, upon the first onset of the Turks and amid the first alarm of Europe. And now for forty years the Turks had held secure possession of Jerusalem, and every year their treatment of Christian pilgrims grew less severe. There was but a single circumstance that seemed to promise greater success to Urban than to Hildebrand, and that was a division of the Mohammedan power between the Sultan of Bagdad and the Sultan of Asia Minor. And yet, in this time of peace and of immeasurably slighter provocation than that of twenty years before, the announcement of Peter's plans, and Urban's sanction of them, fired all Europe. In the last years of the Crusades, again, when the danger was greater than ever before, when the Turks were most united, powerful and threatening, when every Christian had been driven from Syria, when means of transport and the art of war were far better known than in the earlier Crusades, all the authority of the Popes, aided by royal influence, could not raise even the shadow of an army against an enemy now almost at their doors. These facts are explicable only upon the admission that the people, and not the popes, were the real movers in the Crusades.

Guizot has stated the moral cause to be the impulse of religious feeling and belief, and he calls the Crusades the crisis of the conflict which had been raging for four hundred years between two hostile religions. And Stanley, in his History of the Eastern Church, tells us that the Crusades owed their origin entirely to the conflict with Islam. There is a sense in which these utterances are true, but they are capable of leaving a radically false impression. They leave the impression that these wars were essentially offensive, and prompted by hatred of false religion. It may be doubted whether any long or extensive war has been carried on by a people solely from such motives. The individual soldier, and the army in mass, risk life from positive, not from negative motives; not simply to wreak vengeance, but to gain advantage; not simply to destroy, but to win. Hatred of the Turk was but the negative and subordinate side, a necessary incident in the accomplishment of a positive aim. That the Crusades cannot be explained as a merely

natural crisis of long cherished religious hostility, which had been growing in the mind of Europe for centuries, seems clear from the fact that the causes for this hostility were not nearly so great at this time, as they had been thirty or forty years before. Just forty years before Peter's preaching — about 1064, as Findlay tells us — a pilgrimage was undertaken by certain German bishops with a retinue of seven thousand persons, and three fourths of this number perished from suffering and the sword. Christianity had overcome Mohammedanism in Europe four centuries before. Then, in reality, the question of precedence had been decided between the two rival religions; and it seems incredible that, after four centuries of peace, the hostility that remained should have ripened naturally, under no peculiarly favoring circumstances, into an intensity of hatred so universal and so stupendous in its results.

No, it was a new feeling, a hitherto unthought of impulse, which absorbed this hostility into itself and used it for its purpose. The struggle which followed was a religious struggle, not simply in the sense of war to the death against falsehood, but in the sense of war to the death for what was conceived to be positive truth. We assert that a universal awakening of religious feeling, and of religious feeling that had in it an element of truth, was the moving cause of the Crusades, and that a great part of this feeling was earnest and genuine. We cannot define this universal sentiment in any terms which would imply that it was predominantly sensual or selfish. We cannot attribute the sudden rising of Europe to the special indulgences which were now for the first time granted. These had their influence, but when we search for the main cause of these wars, we may almost disregard them. There were two classes of Crusaders — those who went from utterly selfish motives, and those who were animated by a purer spirit. There were those of the first class — "moderate sinners," as Gibbon calls them, who had already incurred a debt of three hundred years of penance — a debt which, under ordinary circumstances, neither their lives nor their fortunes could pay. These were under absolute subjection to the priests, and the remission of all past penance and indulgence for all future sin were surely worth a journey to Palestine. "God," says the Abbot Guibert, "invented the Crusades, as a new way for the laity to atone for their sins and to merit salvation."

But, after all, the majority of Crusaders were possessed by a higher impulse than this. The "Deus vult!" which followed the speech of Urban, had in it a real significance. It was an imaginative and curious age. God was believed to interfere in the affairs of men. Political affairs were governed, not so much by considerations of state-craft, as by theological considerations. Anxieties about the balance of power in Europe would have been an anachronism. And the great idea of the Middle Ages was the idea of the external unity and supreme authority of the Church. The traditions of the Roman Empire had descended to Hildebrand and to Innocent III, as well as to Henry IV and to Frederick II, and of these the Church and not the State was at this time the world-conquering and world-ruling power. It was an idea which could take possession of prince and people alike. National animosities and royal jealousies yielded to its influence. A kingdom of Christ on earth, before which serf and emperor alike should bow, and under

whose shadow the nations should rest secure — this was the dream of the time. And this kingdom was to be a literal and visible kingdom of Christ himself. Far and wide over Europe was spread the idea that the thousand years of prophecy were nearly accomplished, and that the great dragon was to be loosed. Christ was to judge the earth in Palestine, and all true followers should meet him there. Charters granted at that period begin with the words: "*Appropinquante mundi termino.*" Many were the saints who, before the Crusades broke out, had abandoned all and fled to Palestine. What extravagance could be deemed impossible when the general rising once began! The great design of delivering the Holy Sepulchre, already all-important in the mind of Christendom, gained at once a novel and surprising power. The whole system of sensuous worship culminated in the worship of the Holy Sepulchre, and to meet Christ in the Holy City, after having delivered his tomb from the sacrilege of infidel possession, was the highest ambition of millions.

Thus a general belief in an express and direct command of God, an unhesitating conviction of the sole right of the Church to world-wide sway, and an identification of that sway with the possession of Christ's tomb in Palestine, were the sources of a religious enthusiasm, such as the world has never seen before or since. All other causes were as nothing compared with this generous and uncalculating zeal for the outward dominion of Christ and his Church. No one can see the hosts of Crusaders led on by ignorant monks, or by men taken from the rabble, through German forests and Byzantian plains, falling by hundreds at every step, yet pressing on through famine and pestilence and death, refusing to halt after their toils in the soft Phrygian vales, refusing to assist their leaders in any scheme of conquest but the conquest of Jerusalem, yet half a million of them perishing before they got to Antioch,— no one, I say, can look upon this spectacle and not believe that there was one feeling that united them, and that this feeling was a deep though misplaced religious ardor. These most disastrous yet most unselfish of wars, as Lecky calls them, were due to an intense religious enthusiasm — an enthusiasm which for two hundred years rose again and again, fresh and ardent, from utter and hopeless defeat. How great the problem is, may be judged from the following significant words of Michaud, the modern historian of the Crusades. "No power on earth," he says, "could have been able to produce such a revolution. It belongs only to Him whose will marshals and disperses tempests, to throw all at once into human hearts that enthusiasm which silenced all other passions, and drew on the multitude as by an invisible power." What Michaud would seem to relegate to the category of miracle, we prefer to call Providence and the working of second causes, and our final word of explanation is this: The Crusades were the climax of a vast popular movement towards the sensuous and external in Christianity; a movement which the Popes guided, but did not originate; a movement which had power, because whole ages thought it to be in the interests of Christ; a movement which, in its utter defeat, gave useful demonstration to all after ages that Christ's words were true: "My kingdom is not of this world."

In passing to consider the effects of the Crusades, we shall find it needful to distinguish between the immediate and the more remote. Of the former,

I have spoken of but one — the short-lived conquests in the East. They were short-lived for many reasons. The Turks had learned much of the art of war from their Christian invaders, and were increasingly prepared to repel attack. Let us add to this the diminished interest of the West in the Crusades themselves. Without proper reinforcements, the Franks wasted away, till the whole army of the King of Jerusalem consisted of less than six thousand men, and of this number, according to William of Tyre, less than a thousand were mounted knights. Luxury and an enervating climate, together with habits of unbridled license, enfeebled the Latins. To their weakness the Turks at last opposed the solid union of all the Mohammedan principalities under a single chief. The hearts of the Crusaders sank within them. In the first Crusade, the patron saints of each nation were seen in the van of battle, as the Greeks at Marathon saw Theseus with his mighty brazen club leading on the charge. But these wonders grew less frequent, and as imagination gave place to reason, the Latins shed no tears on resigning the keys of the Holy Sepulchre again into the hands of the infidels.

Another immediate effect of the Crusades was the outlet which it afforded to the lawless passions and unoccupied strength of feudalism. We are told by Gibbon, that the waste of life and treasure was an uncompensated loss to the world. It remains for Gibbon, if he would maintain his thesis, to show, what is contrary to all the evidence, namely, that feudalism was not verging upon a state of utter anarchy, in which the overboiling spirit that showed itself in desolation and outrage all over Europe, would without a seasonable outlet have blown to pieces the whole fabric of society. The lives lost in the East would almost beyond a doubt have otherwise been lost in intestine strife at home. We regard the Crusades therefore as a politic diversion to Asia of the tide of war, which else would have deluged the frontiers of the European kingdoms, and prevented the quiet growth of those institutions of modern times which were then in embryo. Or, to return to the former figure, we see in the Crusades from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries the very safety-valve of European civilization.

Yet another great and immediate effect was the strengthening of the barrier against the Turks — a horde of barbarians far more rude and predatory than the original followers of the Prophet. It is indeed so certain that, but for the Crusades, the states of Europe would have fallen one by one into the hands of the advancing enemy, that Michaud has said that "this is the first and greatest of all the benefits they have conferred upon humanity." Constantinople, the bulwark of the West, was on the point of falling. The Crusades saved the life of that capital for yet four hundred years. Within those four hundred years, Europe became civilized, and her arts and sciences came to be her sure and eternal defense against the infidels. The Crusades constructed a barrier against the Turks,— but the greatest barrier was, as Freeman has pointed out, not a barrier of arms, but a moral barrier. The principle was once, and once for all, established, that all Christian powers were natural allies against Mohammedan powers. In short, Europe appears as Europe, first in the Crusades.

If we turn from the immediate results to those which are more remote, we find much greater difficulty in tracing, and as a natural result, much greater diversity of opinion with regard to them among historians. It is, indeed,

not yet a century, since the opinion of Hume and Gibbon seemed to be that the holy wars were simply a monument of human folly, without any rational and sufficient end. Of course, we can believe this of no single event, — much less of the great drama before us. Let us first inquire what were the results to the Church. Michaud divides the period of the Crusades into two parts, each of a hundred years. In the first of these, the Papal authority increased until it reached its final height. In the second, it again declined, until at the end of the two centuries it was smaller than it had been at the beginning. The truth is that it was not till the second Crusade that the Popes saw the power they might exert. The spirit of the Crusade surprised them, for they did not originate it. Striving then by all means to make themselves its masters, though they gained great power at first, the staff on which they leaned soon broke, and they fell even below their former authority. Some of the advantages which they gained were these. The Crusades from first to last were preached in their name. By leading, they secured general reverence. They became possessed of power, as the protectors of the families of the absent crusaders. They assumed to dispense from all civil and religious penalties. They were made arbiters in all disputes between rival princes and kings. They made the Crusades the pretext for usurping in all the states of Europe the attributes of sovereignty. They levied armies and taxes for the holy wars. Their legates exercised supreme authority in their name. By an admirable legal fiction, the legate received by proxy the submission due to the master, and as if he were the Pope himself, had absolute command of the clergy, then the most influential body in the state. Crusading vows were held *in terrorem* over even princes and emperors. And when all these prerogatives were assumed, the empire of the Popes had no limits, — the Bishop of Rome was the liege lord of mankind.

As the rightful leaders of religious wars, the Popes were enabled to bend these wars to their own ends. The secular power became the mere instrument of the pontifical will. "Thus," says Hallam, "was developed that persecuting spirit, which produced the devastation of Languedoc, the stakes and scaffolds of the Inquisition, and which rooted deep in the religious theory of Europe those maxims of intolerance, which it has so slowly and so imperfectly renounced." And Milman has shown how Crusades against the Turks were fitly accompanied by the slaughter of Jews in every city on the Rhine, and how the massacre of the Albigenses in the south of France, the expeditions of Teutonic knights against the northern heathen, the expulsion of the Moors from Spain, the conquest of Mexico by Cortez, and Philip the Second's exterminating war upon the Netherlands — in short, every war against those whom the Pope was pleased to call heretics and infidels — came to be dignified and hallowed by the sacred name of the cross. Of all the religious persecutions conducted or sanctioned by the Roman See, the fruitful seed was planted when Urban made his plea at Clermont eight hundred years ago.

And yet vaulting ambition never more signally overleaped itself, than in these mighty assumptions of temporal power on the part of the Papacy. The hand that grasped began to wither, even as it touched the prize. The Popes gained no lasting influence in the East. Instead of being reconciled

and absorbed, the Byzantine empire was alienated forever,— the crusading armies were swarms of locusts that stripped the eastern provinces that they visited, of every green thing. The disputes in which the sovereign Pontiff was arbiter, often embarrassed him without giving him real power. As time advanced, his commands were not seldom disobeyed, and, without secular power to enforce his decrees instantly and without appeal, his authority fell into disrepute. Amid the disorders of the eastern wars, and far from all prospect of punishment, the Crusaders learned an independence of ecclesiastical, as well as of civil, authority. Orders of armed monks, like the Templars and the Hospitalers, attained a dangerous wealth and influence. The armies blessed by the Popes were too often diverted from their sacred object to wars of ambition and conquest. The tenths for every Crusade, and for every attempt at a Crusade, led to searching questions as to their disposal. Funds raised, but misappropriated, furnished strong weapons to Luther even after the lapse of three centuries. The personal motives with which the later Crusades were preached became too plain to be mistaken. Complaint began, and complaints against the Vicar of God, though a novelty at first, grew at last so deep and strong as to endanger all that had been gained through centuries of usurpation.

The Papal authority suffered greatly from the growth of temporal powers which the Crusades assisted. There had been reason enough why the Church should rule. There was no other stable element in society. It alone, of all mediæval institutions, was stable, because it had its root in opinions and beliefs. Without this possession of great power on the part of the Church, it is difficult to see how Europe could have been civilized. But, as the governments of the several States became efficient, the need of Church power diminished. As we shall see, the Crusades did much to bring about this settlement of the monarchies of Europe. It was only a natural consequence that, as the great temporal powers became established and consolidated, the Popes should lose their ascendency in European politics.

The idea has prevailed that the clergy amassed great wealth during the Crusades. This was true during the first Crusade, for which they were not compelled to pay. Landed property, in which the Jew did not deal, but upon which ecclesiastical establishments lent money, fell to the Church in immense tracts. But, in all the subsequent Crusades, contributions were levied upon ecclesiastics also. Churches sold their ornaments and sacred vases to pay these taxes, and a competent authority has estimated that in two hundred years the clergy expended for the holy wars a larger sum than would have purchased all their property. Hence, their crusading zeal perceptibly cooled, so that the Popes did not dare intrust the preaching of the later Crusades to the bishops, but committed it to the Mendicant Orders, who had nothing to lose by it.

Guizot mentions another effect upon the Church, which must be taken with a grain of allowance. Laymen, he urges, had hitherto had no direct communication with the centre of the Church. Now they passed through Rome. They saw the Papacy and its abuses, without ecclesiastical spectacles. Church and people were brought nearer to each other, and the latter acquired new boldness. It was the beginning of that inspection and inquiry which terminated in the revolt of Luther. But let us not attribute to the mediæval

traveler a spirit too far in advance of his time. There were other influences at Rome, which might have served to repress his skepticism. Whatever of art the West possessed was there. Passing through the Eternal City, may we not fairly represent him as dazzled with the splendors of the pontifical throne, and as departing with no greater diminution of his reverence than happens to a modern Catholic in his visit to the seat of St. Peter?

And yet, there was such a thing as corruption of the clergy, and a large part of the subsequent infamy of Popes and priesthood must be traced back to its beginning in these wars,—and here was the secret of the downfall of Papal power. What the Hohenstaufen could not accomplish by any outward force, that internal rottenness did accomplish, namely, the collapse of the lofty structure of pontifical supremacy over the princes and kings of the earth. Such corruption was inseparable from the life of armies,—and of those armies the clergy constituted a part. Prelates arrayed themselves in cuirass and helmet; country priests led on their flocks to battle. The Crusades were one long school of licentiousness and ferocity. Morality was outraged by the excesses of ecclesiastics in the holy wars. Meddling in what were soon perceived to be mere human strifes, and carried away by every passion that degraded ordinary humanity, the ministers of the Church, and the Church itself, lost immeasurably more than they gained. If I am pointed to the great works of the scholastic theology which from this epoch began to proceed from the monasteries, I call them signs, not of advancing power in the Church, but rather of the new intellectual spirit which followed the Crusades, and which the Church could not resist. During these two hundred years, the doctrines and opinions of the Church suffered no material change. Dogmatic theology, like pure literature, seldom flourishes in times so averse to silent and steady thought; and, therefore, we are warranted in asserting without reserve that, before the two crusading centuries were over, the acme of the power of Ecclesiastical Rome had passed, and the Papacy had entered upon that slow decline which has proceeded intermittently, but surely, from that time until the present day.

We have considered the influence of these great wars upon the Church,—let us look for a moment at their effects upon the State. The cardinal point on which mediæval history turns is nothing else than the struggle of theocracy against feudal monarchy,—so says a great philosopher of history, and truly, German and metaphysician though he be. And what the Crusades did for feudalism, must be regarded as one of the foremost benefits which they have conferred upon mankind. They were the first great event of the period from the twelfth to the sixteenth century, in which the isolated elements of European society came for the first time together, and began those experiments which ended in the establishment of European as well as national unity. It is only since the thirteenth century that we can call France a nation, or really speak of monarchy and nobility, of government and people. From isolation and antagonism, these elements united with each other, and formed what was before unknown—the compacted State.

This is plain, when we compare the age which preceded with the age which followed the Crusades. Charlemagne had exhausted every power of royalty in the endeavor to establish a second Roman Empire; but, after his death, the bow was again unstrung, and society fell into its former isolation.

He had waged war upon the feudal system, because it destroyed all protective power, all tutelary and national legislation. The monarch, without authority, could not be the supporter of innocence or the avenger of crime. Sovereignty was exercised by every man who had a sword, and the feudal noble was little inferior, and paid only nominal subjection to the King. Though this individualism was a protection against despotism and universal conquest, though it had within it the seeds of all after-ideas of chivalry and freedom, it did not give stability to government or to justice. It was necessary that individualism should give place to a concentrated power, which could punish offenders and build up a united state. From the ancient civilization, in which the State absorbed the individual, society had swung to the precisely opposite extreme, — each individual could say with Louis the Fourteenth: "I am the State." What was needed, if civilization should advance or even be rescued, was a combination of the two ideas — individual independence, with its variety and freedom, but individual independence regulated and harmonized into compact society by the overshadowing force of equal laws.

The first result of the Crusades that tended in this direction was the absorption of small fiefs into the large. Many a great baron who served in these wars died without heirs, and his estates reverted to the crown; many a vassal who was fired with crusading ardor, yet could not by feudal custom raise the expenses of his expedition by extraordinary taxes, sold his fief to the Crown, in expectation of conquering a richer one in Palestine. William Rufus bought his elder brother's dukedom of Normandy. By the assemblies, which, though disused for a hundred years, were now called to consult with the King, the Crown was aided in recovering the lost legislative power. The great vassals of France, besides, scarcely acknowledged a King of France until they beheld these Kings of France gathering glory and dominion in the holy wars. Thus, in France, was seen an aggrandizement of royalty, both in territory and influence, which was necessary to the future civilization of Europe, — and this aggrandizement was at the expense of a turbulent and powerful feudal nobility.

France undoubtedly furnishes the best illustration of the influence of the Crusades on feudalism. At the beginning of these wars, we see monarchy weaker in France than in any other European nation. At their close monarchy in France is stronger than in any other. Through the influences we have mentioned, there have come at last to be, in place of a variety of ruling classes — clergy, kings, nobles, citizens, husbandmen and serfs — only two, namely, government and people. Thus was brought about a localization of society and a union of its separate elements into the unity of the State, without which there could be no general administration of justice, no end of private war, no broad and wise legislation.

And yet, beyond the mere organization of elements hitherto scattered and inharmonious, something must be attributed to the new spirit of gentleness and conciliation which made this organization possible. No account of the settling of modern society can be complete which omits all mention of the influence of chivalry. The loyalty, liberality and courtesy of knighthood was to a large extent the fruit of the Crusades. It was something for a baron of the eleventh or twelfth century to take upon him even the semblance of a religious vow. It was more, when the youth became a knight

through a prolonged novitiate in which his qualities of loyalty and bravery were equally tested, and his final enterprises received the sanction and blessing of the church. Service of the church in a war against infidels was not the highest conceivable service, but it was far higher than the brutal license and unprovoked marauding to which the Crusader had given himself at home. And men are civilized by frequent meeting with each other. Isolation would have left the French noble the same old barbarian. Company with brave men gave him the first start toward chivalry. Wonderful contrasts there doubtless are, in those old chronicles. Godfrey could burn Jews alive, but he would not be called King, in the city where Christ had worn a crown of thorns. The crusading army could slaughter seventy thousand Saracens without mercy, but they could close the day of carnage by falling on their knees with one accord, and bursting into tears as they thought upon the sufferings of their Redeemer. But on the whole they came back better than they went, and with them they brought into the life and intercourse of Europe the first beginnings of that spirit tender and true, pitiful and brave — the spirit of generosity and aspiration and loyalty and honor — which still in the modern gentleman preserves whatever of worth there was in chivalry.

Not simply the castles of the barons, however, but the towns and cities of Europe, felt the influence of the Crusades. The Mediterranean capitals, enriched by the transport and trade of the Crusaders, were enabled to assert their liberty or to buy it of their Suzerain. Alexander III struck an alliance with the whole group of Lombard towns; and, in order to construct a bulwark against Germany, he gave them freedom and constituted himself as their defender. The Italian cities became little republics, able to wage wars of offense through their hired troops, and to maintain their independence against all invaders. The seaports had their fleets and conducted their naval expeditions against the Saracens, or against enemies nearer home. Venice could lose thirteen thousand sailors in one defeat, yet easily recover from the blow. And, with Venice, Genoa, Pisa, Florence, all rose to magnificence, and shed abroad the influence of a free and enterprising spirit. Now were erected the Campaniles of Florence, Venice and Bologna, which, like the Belfries of Ghent and Bruges in the Netherlands, were none of them erected for purely sacred purposes, but as the means of summoning together inhabitants of town and surrounding country alike, in any sudden emergency in which free citizens might be called upon to act. So strong and widespread was this tendency to municipal freedom, that before the conclusion of the last Crusade, all the considerable cities of Italy had purchased or extorted large immunities from the Emperors and the Popes. From Italy the freedom of corporate towns spread to France and Germany, and a great body of the people in those lands became released from feudal servitude. These communities did much to introduce regular government, police, arts, and the spirit of liberty, among the mass of the people. And thus, to the political unity, which was one result of the Crusades, was added another, no less important, namely, the liberty of the individual citizen.

But one other result of the Crusades remains to be noticed — a result which, though the most difficult to be fully understood, was perhaps the greatest of their benefits, for it may be said to underlie all the others — I

mean the impulse which the Crusades gave to the human intellect. We need only to compare the condition of Europe at the beginning of these wars — sunk in ignorance and barbarism — with the bright promise of all things at their conclusion, to realize that a great change had been already wrought. Travel showed to the Franks a new and unimagined world. Constantinople was the greatest and most beautiful city in Europe. The barbarian had never wasted it. Though freedom and virtue had departed, the ancient elegance of arts and manners remained. The Eastern Court was one of oriental magnificence. Even the Mohammedans had still the remnants of a high civilization. While the Arabian and the Greek writers always speak of the Franks as barbarians, William of Tyre never loses an opportunity to extol the virtues of Saladin, and the beauty of Constantinople. Western Europe caught an inspiration from the sight, and from this time advanced in refinement of manners and of arts. Manufactures were carried west. New inventions were imported into Europe. Navigation and discovery entered upon a new career of progress. The world began to travel. Marco Polo roved over Asia; a Franciscan of Naples became Archbishop of Pekin; and Sir John Mandeville, the poet and physician, traversed the jungles of Hindustan and the streets of Foutchou. Much need was there of travel, — for two hundred authors writing on Egypt make no mention of the Pyramids, and James of Vitry gravely talks about the Phœnix and the Amazons of the East.

In the chronicles of St. Denis, Anno Domini 1257, we read: "William, a physician, brought some Greek books from Constantinople." It was the first gleam of new light for the West. Then came the revival of literature and art. Poetry was written once more, and the foundations of modern literature were laid. The old French didactic poetry sprang into being. The Troubadours sang through the south of France, and the Minnesingers answered them from Germany. The mighty mediæval architecture, full of a religious spirit from the age before, rose to the admiration of all after time. In Paris, and Oxford, and Bologna, ten thousand students were opening every day unthought-of mines of classic beauty, and were digging with all reverence into the treasures of the Roman law. From roots that lay deep hidden in the black soil of desolation and disaster, was growing up a fair new civilization.

XLVIII.

DANTE AND THE DIVINE COMEDY.*

Once upon a time, as the story-books would say, or, to speak more historically and exactly, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and eighty-six, and in the month of August, a little company of fairly intelligent people determined to put their vacation to use. The scene and the surroundings were propitious. We were upon the banks of Canandaigua Lake, the loveliest of those parallel sheets of water which so diversify the landscape of central and western New York. From the veranda, where we assembled after breakfast, Bear Hill loomed up across the lake, like Vesuvius over the Bay of Naples. The quiet summer mornings, the shade of the great elms, and the deep blue sky, invited us to something more serious than *vers de société*. Some one spoke of the Divine Comedy, and wondered if anybody had ever read it through. It was a revelation, a challenge, and an admonition. Most of us had read the Inferno, but had been so ill-pleased with Dante's Hell, that we had never cared to try his Purgatory, or even his Paradise. But a new resolve was taken. We would begin, and finish. Forthwith were produced the translations of Carey, Wright, and Longfellow. Two of us knew something of Italian, and had with us the original poem. We brought to our help the English version of Dr. Carlyle and Mr. Butler, with the Italian original on the same page. Best of all, we read by way of introduction and of comment "The Shadow of Dante," by Maria Francesca Rossetti, from which I take much of value in the composition of this Essay. An hour and a half each morning for four weeks sufficed to accomplish our task. Indeed it was no task; the pauses for discussion were numberless; its beauty grew upon us; when we finally closed our books the four weeks seemed four days, for the love we bore to the poet and the poem. I have since read the essays of James Russell Lowell and of Dean Church — the former very learned and thoughtful, though conceived from a literary point of view; the latter strong and eloquent, the work of a moralist and a preacher. I undertake now to give the condensed result in my own mind of this bit of summer study,— not, however, without the expectation and acknowledgment that pieces of others' learning will here and there shine through my writing, as through a palimpsest. I have let my reader into the secret of its origin, if by any means I may tempt him to go and do likewise.

Dante Alighieri was born in Florence, in the year 1265,— so that my story takes us back more than six hundred years. The middle ages were coming to their end. The Crusades had wakened Europe from her sleep of centuries; the classic literature had begun to attract its devotees; the free cities

*A Lecture delivered at Vassar College, February 21 and 22, 1888, and printed in the Chicago Standard, December, 1887.

had established themselves; there was everywhere the stir of new political and religious life. But it was a time of strife. The Guelphs, the party of the Popes, and the Ghibellines, the party of the Emperors, were hotly contesting every point of vantage in city and country; although in Italy the Ghibellines were strong in the provincial districts, while the Guelphs were strong in the towns. To the Guelph party Dante's family belonged. He does not appear to have been of noble birth, for he afterwards held office,— and the constitution of Florence at the time forbade this to nobles. But he does appear to have been born to wealth; he certainly possessed the means of the highest education the age could give; he was ever in the front rank of his contemporaries, both in society and in politics. Of his youth we have handed down to us but a single incident,— fortunately, that was the most important incident of his life. It was his meeting with Beatrice.

At the age of nine years he first saw the lady of his dreams. It was at a festival at the house of her father, Folco Portinari. She was but a little damsel, no older than himself, but she was habited in crimson, and the sight of her was the awakening of his spirit. The next meeting of which we have record was nine years after, and that seems to have been a casual encounter on the street, leaving only a glance and a gentle word to be remembered. We do not know that Dante ever sought Beatrice in marriage; she was a star apart, to be looked at from afar; she married another, and she died at twenty-four; she probably never knew of the influence she exerted; and yet, from the day of that festival at her father's house, she was the ruler of Dante's soul. Sense did not mingle with his passion. Beatrice became to him the symbol of all spiritual beauty. When he reaches Paradise, he is lifted from each lower sphere of heaven to the next higher simply by gazing into the transparent depths of Beatrice's eyes. "The thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts," and the resolves then formed prove often the strongest resolves of a life-time. So the loves of youth may be long, long loves. A true affection never dies, and the Psalmist never spoke more truly, than when he said: "Your heart shall live forever." That meeting at the festival was not the first time, nor the last time, that the sight of a little damsel in pink or blue has turned the head of some great man, and so has changed the face of the world.

I wish we could say that Dante was absolutely faithful to the memory of Beatrice. But history, and his own acknowledgments, are too much for us. There was a little time when, possibly to distract his mind after her death, he plunged into a skeptical philosophy and yielded to the attractions of sense. A rival, whom he calls the adversary of reason, and whom he pictures as a woman at a window, temporarily absorbed his thoughts. But the spell could not last. Let us adapt and use the lines of Tennyson:

> "Faith in womankind
> Beat with his blood, and trust in all things high
> Came easy to him; and, though he tripped and fell,
> He could not blind his soul with clay."

How noble a lesson there is in the fact that the breaking of the evil spell is coincident with a second vision of Beatrice! As there rises before his imagination the fair form of his lost love, still habited in crimson as he had seen her so long before, yet now invested with a purity and glory that belonged to

heaven rather than to earth, the chains of sense and of unbelief seem to fall away from Dante's soul. The new life begins, of which the *Vita Nuova* is the history. Beatrice, who has rescued him, becomes to him God's angel and minister, the perfect combination of nature and grace, the symbol and embodiment of that heavenly wisdom which alone can free man from the anguish of doubt and the degradation of sin. Henceforth he identifies her with divine philosophy, and in token of his renewed and perpetual allegiance to his first-beloved he writes these words: "There appeared to me a marvelous vision, wherein I saw things which made me resolve to say no more of this blessed one until I could more worthily treat of her. And to come to this I study as much as I can, as she knows in truth. So that if it be the pleasure of Him by whom all things live that my life shall last somewhat longer, I hope to say of her that which has never yet been said of any woman. And may it then please Him who is the Lord of loving-kindness that my soul may go to behold the glory of its lady, that is, that blessed Beatrice who gloriously gazes upon the face of Him who is blessed forever!"

And so the Divine Comedy is Beatrice's monument. It was the labor of a life-time. It was prepared for by profound and extensive studies. What is true of every great poet was especially true of Dante — he was master of all the learning of his time. It was easier then than now, to compass all human knowledge. Thomas Aquinas had written, and from his immense *Summa* the poet had learned theology. Aristotle furnished him with his philosophy. Homer and Virgil were his masters in poetry. He was deeply read in history, both sacred and profane. Whatever of physical science had then been discovered, whatever of medicine or of law was taught in the schools, all the culture that music, painting, architecture and sculpture could give — all these were Dante's possession. But more than this, he was a man among men, a citizen, a diplomatist, a statesman. Grave yet eloquent, composed yet capable of heroic decisions, an ardent lover of his country and a soldier in her defense, he had that large knowledge of affairs and that experience of human nature which fitted him to speak to the very heart of his generation, and indeed to the human heart in all ages and everywhere. He had moreover the sublime self-confidence of genius. He entered unabashed into the company of the greatest poets, as he met them in the world of spirits; and, even in Florence, when it was proposed to send him on an embassy to Rome, he replied: "If I go, who remains? and if I remain, who goes?"

But neither study nor political life alone would have qualified him to write his great poem. It needed the heavy blows of exile, poverty and suffering, to forge the argument of the Divine Comedy. In the year 1300, Dante was elected one of the chief-magistrates of Florence; and, perceiving that his native city could have no peace unless the leaders of its factions were banished, he used his two months of brief authority to send these leaders beyond the borders of the state. It was a patriotic and unselfish act; for among them, and in either party, were certain of his personal friends. It was abstract justice, without regard to consequences; and when the tide turned and his enemies returned to power, they gave him the same measure which he had meted out to them. In 1302 a heavy fine was imposed upon him, and when he refused to pay, his entire estate was confiscated, and it was decreed that, if he should be found again in Florence, he should be burned

alive. Henceforth Dante became a wanderer upon the face of the earth. In 1310 he appears to have gone to Paris,—perhaps to Oxford. After his return he was offered amnesty, upon condition of paying fine and acknowledging criminality. But he scorned to enter Florence except with honor. "The means of life will not fail me," he said. "In any case I shall be able to gaze upon the sun and stars, and to meditate upon the sweetest truths of philosophy."

Let us enter in imagination into the fortunes of this son of Florence, her truest patriot and her greatest man, cast out by an unloving mother, though every stone of her streets and every foot of her soil were sacred to him as they could be to no other. He became a Ghibelline, in hope that the Emperor's coming would restore just authority and would right the wrong. Poor, and exposed to all "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune," he wandered from one petty Ghibelline court to another, illustrating all too well the words of his own prophecy:

> "Thou shalt have proof how savoreth of salt
> The bread of others, and how hard a road
> The going down and up another's stairs."

The lines of sweetness in his youthful portrait hardened and deepened into the sad, stern countenance of his later years. The very dignity of his nature, that forbade outward complaint, threw him inward upon himself.

> "Seldom he smiled, and smiled in such a sort
> As if to scorn his nature that could be moved
> To smile at anything."

Yet morose and despairing he never did become. As the outward darkness of his lot deepened about him, a light that never was on sea or land "so much the more shone inward." As he walked up and down in Northern Italy, leaving traditions of his sojournings connected with many a ruined castle and mountain-torrent, there were opening before his vision great truths with regard to God and his judgments; he was gathering vast knowledge of nature and of the human heart; aye, he was mapping out heaven, earth and hell, for the generations to come. There can be no doubt that he regarded himself as a sort of prophet. From the heavenly spheres he looked down upon this earth of trial and sifting, and saw the meaning of it:

> "The threshing-floor that maketh us so proud,
> To me, revolving with the eternal Twins,
> Was all apparent made, from hill to harbor."

And so, revolving the Divine Comedy and bringing it into form, he passed nineteen years of sorrowful exile, until at last, far from home, at Ravenna, in the year 1321, and at the age of fifty-seven, Dante Alighieri died.

Before speaking of the great poem in detail, it will be desirable to say something about the end which Dante had in view, and the means which he uses to attain it. The first of its hundred cantos is a sort of Introduction to the whole, and we may well avail ourselves of the hints it gives us. Its first line,

> "In midway of the journey of this life,"

has doubtless a personal reference to the history of the writer, and fixes the date when its composition began at 1300, when Dante had just reached the age of thirty-five, having passed halfway through the three-score years and

ten allotted to man. On the first day of that new year and that new century, he describes himself as wandering, half asleep, from the right path, and becoming entangled in the mazes of a dark wood. Before him rises a hill, to which he makes his way and up which he essays to climb, until he finds himself withstood and repelled in succession by three wild beasts, a swift leopard, a raging lion and a greedy wolf. These well-nigh drive him back upon the sunless plain, when suddenly he becomes aware that he is not alone. A gracious and majestic figure approaches, and offers succor and conduct:

"Follow thou me, and I will be thy guide
And bring thee hence by an eternal place,
Where thou shalt hearken the despairing shrieks,
Shalt see the ancient spirits dolorous
That each one outcries for the second death.
And thou shalt then see those who are content
Within the fire, because they hope to come,
When that it be, unto the blessed race.
To whom thereafter, if thou wouldst ascend,
A soul there'll be more worthy this than I:
Thee will I leave with her, when I depart;
Seeing that Emperor who above there rules,
Because I was rebellious to his law,
Wills to his City no access by me.
In every part he sways, and there he reigns;
There is his City and the exalted seat,—
Oh, happy he whom thither he elects!"

It is Virgil who thus offers himself as Dante's conductor through Hell and Purgatory; it is Beatrice who has sent him for Dante's deliverance, and who is to be his guide through Paradise after Virgil has led him through the two lower provinces of God's empire.

Many have been the interpretations put upon the great poem. The true interpretation is that which finds in it a combination of meanings. Dante himself has told us that there are four separate senses which he intends his story to convey. There is the literal, the allegorical, the moral, and the anagogical. In Psalm 114: 1, we have the words, "When Israel went out of Egypt." This, says the poet, may be taken literally, of the actual deliverance of God's ancient people; or allegorically, of the redemption of the world through Christ; or morally, of the rescue of the sinner from the bondage of his sin; or anagogically, of the passage of both soul and body from the lower life of earth to the higher life of heaven. So, from Scripture, Dante illustrates the method of his poem. We have his own warrant for beginning with the literal meaning, and for then superadding the spiritual. Nothing can be more plain than the personal element that runs through the poem — Dante's own life and spiritual struggles furnish the basis for all the rest. We cannot be far wrong in maintaining that the beginning of the poem describes Dante's own entanglement in the thickets of sense and unbelief; his early efforts to make his way up the mount of knowledge and virtue by strength of his own; the demonstration of his inability to cope with the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life — the three adversaries which like wild beasts would drag him down; the offer and the acceptance of superior aid, in order that he may know the truth and the truth may make him free; and then his gradual growth in knowledge and holiness, as one after another the sins and infirmities of the soul are revealed and are put

beneath his feet, until at last he rises to communion with God and to the society of the holy. In other words, and yet more briefly, the Divine Comedy is an autobiographical Pilgrim's Progress, written from the point of view of the Middle Ages and the Roman Church.

But this is only the beginning. Around and upon this core and foundation, is built up a wondrous symbolic structure, in which Dante has sought to express his ideas of God's relations to humanity. It has been well said that the ancient epic never rose above the individual. "Arms and the man I sing," said Virgil. Dante sings, not of himself, nor of any particular man alone, but of man in the largest sense,— "his subject is man — as by merit or demerit, through freedom of the will, he renders himself liable to the reward or punishment of justice." Man, in this large sense, has two sides to his nature — an earthly and a heavenly, a temporal and a spiritual. In each of these relations he needs authority. God has therefore provided upon earth two rulers, the Pope to be his vicegerent in spiritual, the Emperor to be his vicegerent in temporal, things ; the former like the sun giving forth the light of God's truth directly, the latter like the moon reflecting that of the former ; each has its sphere ; and each, being directly responsible to God, is in a certain sense independent of the other. There is, therefore, a political sense in which the Divine Comedy must be taken ; and the constant interweaving of political incident and philosophy, which has struck so many as beside the purpose of the poem, is only a sign of its larger completeness and unity.

Miss Rossetti has beautifully traced the working of this idea into the introduction of the poem. The darksome wood is the distracted and hopeless political condition of Italy. The hill of virtue and reason, that rose before the mind of Dante was the scheme of a stable and righteous commonwealth. But there was no material to build a city. The Guelph powers beset him. Factious Florence, proud France, avaricious Rome, are respectively the leopard, the lion, and the wolf, that set themselves against all order and all progress. Dante sinks back almost into despair of his country, when Virgil, the symbol of science and philosophy, appears for his deliverance, and brings him to a right understanding of the divine will, so far as the light of nature can go ; and, when that has done its utmost, divine grace, in the person of Beatrice, discovers to him the very consummation of God's plans for the temporal good of humanity.— Whatever we may think of the details of this interpretation, there can be no doubt that in Dante's soul there had dawned the idea of a free State, as well as that of a free Church. He was immeasurably grieved and angered at the insane jealousies and enmities that tore his country in pieces. His prose essay, *De Monarchia*, shows that his advocacy of Ghibelline doctrine, in the latter half of his life, was based upon the conviction that only the supremacy of the Emperor could deliver Italy from the wiles of the Papacy, and give her a strong and solid government.

Italian unity, and the independence of church and state, both found their first great advocate in Dante,— or rather, shall we say, first found germinal expression in his writings. No stronger bond than love for Dante has for centuries, in spite of all her political divisions, preserved a moral unity in Italy. And now at length even Dante's dream of political unity has worked its own realization. The pen has proved mightier than the sword, because it has led men to wield the sword, in securing and defending the unity of Italy.

So far, as to the temporal or political aim of Dante's poem — the settlement of the true principles upon which civil society should be built. This, however, is not its chief aim. The spiritual side of man is more important than this. The poet would set forth the nature of man as a subject of God, free to obey or to disobey, and bound to answer to his own conscience and to Him who made him. And here we must remember that, with all Dante's reverence for God's spiritual vicegerent upon earth, he never fails to distinguish between the office and him who held it — between the Papacy and the individual Popes. He held loyally to Roman Catholic doctrine — indeed, there was none other in his day to hold to — but held to it in no slavish way. He abhorred the temporal power of the Papacy; he regarded it as usurpation of the prerogatives of the State, treachery to the spiritual calling of the Vicar of God, and cause of all the divisions and miseries of Italy. He has denounced the pride and venality of many a Pope, and he has put some of them, heels upward, in hell. We cannot think him lacking in courage, when we hear him calling the rulers of the church "Antichrist:"

> "Your avarice o'erwhelms the world in woe.
> To you St. John referred, O shepherds vile!
> When She, who sits on many waters, had
> Been seen with kings her person to defile;
> (The same, who with seven heads arose on earth,
> And bore ten horns, to prove that power was her's,
> Long as her husband had delight in worth).
> Your gods ye make of silver and of gold;
> And wherein differ from idolaters,
> Save that their god is one, yours manifold?
> Ah Constantine! what evils caused to flow,
> Not thy conversion, but those fair domains
> Thou on the first rich Father didst bestow!"

In Dante's expositions of Scripture he has given us independent judgments; widely read as he was in sacred and patristic learning, we find him ever applying the Bible to matters of common life; as we unconsciously get something of our theology from Milton, many an educated Italian only quotes Dante when he thinks he is quoting the Bible. The whole range and compass of man's spiritual being is the subject of Dante's treatment. He intended nothing less than to set forth the whole process and philosophy of man's fall and man's restoration. Not simply the outward means for the cure of souls, but the great array of spiritual agencies that work for the punishment of the lost and the recovery of the penitent, constitute the subject of his story.

Let us put ourselves again, then, with the poet, in the dreary wood. The poet is only the image of humanity, straying away from God and miserably perishing in its sin. There is left only the voice of conscience to urge it up the steep hill-side of knowledge and virtue, and this upward impulse is more than counteracted by the arts and devices of the great adversary. Humanity needs all the help that can come from both earth and heaven. God sends human teachers, and these show men the nature and the consequences of their sins and the means of purification from them. Virgil is the representative of the highest earthly wisdom. He can lead us to a terrestial paradise; but, if we would pass beyond, we must have a higher guide. Beatrice is divine science, the teaching of the Spirit, God's highest gift to men. He who yields to the lower teaching shall have the higher. Dante's taking Vir-

gil for his guide is the symbol of the whole race of man putting itself under God's elementary tuition, that it may learn the truth that will deliver it from hell and lift it to heaven.

So the poem which has autobiography for its centre, embraces not only the doctrine of the State, but widens out until it takes in universal humanity and the true relations of that humanity to God. The Divine Comedy is an attempt to put all theology and all philosophy into poetical form, that man may have before his eyes an interpretation of the universe of things, a concrete representation of eternal truth, a justification of the ways of God to men. It is the loftiest conception ever framed by any earthly poet, and the execution is worthy of the theme. The Divine Comedy was the first Christian poem; it seems to us also to be the greatest.

So much for Dante's aim; let us consider now the means he used to attain it,—I mean his scheme of the universe, and the external vehicle by which he communicated his thought; or, first, his cosmology, and secondly, his verse. We must remember that Dante lived before Kepler; his system was not the Copernican, but the Ptolemaic. To understand his poem without knowing this, is as impossible as it would be for a school-boy to learn geography without a map. Ptolemy did not hold to a flat, but to a spherical earth; yet he did hold that the earth was the centre of all, and that sun, moon and stars all revolved around it. There were two hemispheres—an eastern hemisphere of land, and a western hemisphere of water. In the centre of the hemisphere of land is the city of Jerusalem, directly over the hollow pit of Hell; in the centre of the hemisphere of water is the island-mount of Purgatory, up whose steep sides all penitents must climb to heaven. Neither Hell nor Purgatory were created where they now are; their present existence and location are results of Satan's fall. When the rebel angel was cast out from heaven, his immense mass and weight crushed through earth's surface to the very centre of the planet; gravity prevented him from going further, and held him there fast bound. The very substance of the globe fled from him in horror, as he came hurtling down, and with these results: first, the great pit of hell was excavated, at the bottom of which Satan lies; secondly, the waters of the eastern hemisphere were transferred to the western, so that the eastern hemisphere is now laid bare; thirdly, the portion of earth's substance displaced to form Hell, since it must go somewhere, was thrust up under the ancient Eden, and so the terrestrial Paradise was made the summit of the purgatorial mountain in the midst of the waste of western waters. Ulysses is the only mortal who has seen that mount, and there it was that he met his fate. Tennyson's poem "Ulysses" is only a reminiscence of Dante. The mount of Purgatory is therefore "exactly at the antipodes of Jerusalem, and its bulk is precisely equal and opposite to the cavity of Hell."

Hell and Purgatory belong to this planet. Earth alone is the abode of sin, and the place of penance. But as we leave earth and go upward we find nine several heavens, one above the other, each a hollow revolving sphere, enclosing and enclosed. These are at once solid and transparent; in them the planets are fixed, to give light by day and night. First comes the heaven of the moon; beyond this the heaven of Mercury; then the heaven of Venus; fourthly, the heaven of the Sun, which Dante, after the fashion of

his time, regarded as a planet revolving round the earth; fifthly, the heaven of Mars; sixthly, the heaven of Jupiter; seventhly, the heaven of Saturn; eightly, the heaven of the Fixed Stars; ninthly, the starless, crystalline heaven or *Primum Mobile*, which moves most rapidly of all, and by so moving communicates movement to all the rest. Beyond all these nine heavens is a tenth, the motionless Empyrean of God and his saints. There the elect spirits of all time, arranged in ranks like the rising seats of an amphitheatre, surround a lake of light formed by the reflection of the divine glory from the convex upper surface of the *Primum Mobile*. It is the Rose of the Blessed, whose petals expanding on every side are made up of countless intelligences, all bright with the purity and the love of the highest heaven.

Such is Dante's scheme of the universe. Let us ask now about his verse. He called his work "The Comedy;" the title "Divine" was given to it by admirers belonging to the next generation. He tells us that the designation "Comedy" was given to it because, though beginning in gloom and sorrow, it has a happy ending; it takes the reader through Hell and Purgatory, but it brings him to Paradise. The average reader, we fear, does not give to Dante's work the benefit of the poet's own explanation. He reads only the "Inferno," and insists on judging the whole by this single part. Here the grotesque and the revolting so fasten his attention that he declines to proceed further. He does not penetrate to the deep philosophy of Dante's treatment; does not see that Dante's aim is to portray the folly and the monstrosity of sin; does not appreciate the poet's aim of making all this a contrast and a foil to the sweetness of penitence and the joy of the redeemed. But he who has the grace and the patience to read the Purgatory, and the Paradise as well, will find that Dante was right in not calling his poem "The Divine Tragedy." Dante is no pessimist. To his mind "all things work together for good;" and so his poem, which was meant to be an interpretation of the universe and a philosophy of history, rightly calls itself a "Comedy," for it describes the uplifting of humanity from sin to holiness, and from eternal sorrow to eternal joy.

But there was still another reason for the cheerful title. The work is written, not in the stately and sonorous Latin with its classic elegance and coldness, but in the humble Italian of common speech, the newly emerging product of a new civilization, the language of the shop and of the home, rather than the language of the schools. And yet it is too much to say that this language existed before Dante wrote. Dante was rather its creator; for the Italian language, with all its sweetness and purity and beauty, the language of love, of poetry, of philosophy, sprang complete from Dante's brain. There is something almost awe-inspiring in the sudden appearance of such a work as his, as new in its literary vehicle as it was in conception and in theme. It did more to fix the language of Italy than the French Academy ever did to fix the French, or the English Bible to fix the English, tongue. Six hundred years ago a language was spoken in France which no common Frenchman can understand to-day; six hundred years ago a language was spoken in England which no common Englishman can understand to-day. But Dante's Italian is the Italian of modern speech. It is well worth while to learn a little Italian, for even a little will enable one to

appreciate to some degree the sweet severity of Dante's verse; the marvelous compression which never wastes a word; the fascination of the *terza rima*, or triple rhyme, whose endless reiterations seem like the recurrent melody, at one time of funeral, and at another time of marriage, bells.

There is scarcely a more striking example of this fitness of phrase than in the solemn music which records the inscription over the gate of Hell:

"Per me si va nella citta dolente;
Per me si va nell' eterno dolore:
Per me si va tra la perduta gente.
Giustizia mosse il mio alto Fattore:
Fecemi la divina Potestate,
La somma Sapienza e il primo Amore.
Dinanzi a me non fur cose create,
Si non eterne, ed eterno duro;
Lasciate ogni speranza, voi ch' entrate."

Let us now compare the Italian with the English, and mark how the liquid and intense quality of the original well-nigh disappears in the translation:

"Through me ye enter the abode of woe:
Through me to endless sorrow are ye brought:
Through me amid the souls accurst ye go.
Justice did first my lofty Maker move;
By Power almighty was my fabric wrought,
By highest Wisdom and by primal Love.
Ere I was formed, no things created were,
Save those eternal — I eternal last:
All hope abandon — ye who enter here!"

The gate is "closed to none, being reft of all its fastenings since the day when the Conqueror of Death, fresh from the cross, forced through it his resistless passage." So Dante, following Virgil as his guide, pursues the deep and savage pathway and enters the Inferno. Let us enter with him. Hell, as we have seen, is a pit within the earth, a hollow, inverted cone, growing narrower as it descends; in which, as space contracts, torment is intensified. The outermost borders of the pit constitute an Ante-Hell, rather than hell itself. It is the abode of the Neutrals, those who are not good enough for Heaven, and who have not character enough for Hell. Here are confined the angels who at the first great rebellion in the spirit-world stood neither for God nor for his enemies, but only for themselves. Here are confined a large part of the human race, even as the circuit of this uppermost region of the Inferno is the widest. These feeble and cowardly souls, stung by flies and wasps, the image of a reproving conscience, chase a hurrying standard, while worms in the dust beneath their feet absorb their blood and tears. So Dante punishes those who only ignored God, but did not have force enough to rebel against him. He crosses the River Acheron, the joyless river, with Charon for his ferryman, who grimly drives the reluctant souls out of his boat with the blows of his oar. So they reach Hell proper, a pit of nine circles, each furnishing a landing-place, on one side of which is the wall of solid earth, on the other the abyss.

The first circle of the Inferno proper is called Limbo — the home of infants who died unbaptized, and of non-believers who had no knowledge of a Saviour. Here once dwelt the saints of Old Testament times; but when Christ descended into the underworld after his resurrection, he rescued

them and led them forth in triumph. Here still, and forever, dwell the heathen sages whose ignorance was invincible. There is no outward infliction. Their pain is the pain of loss, of unsatisfied yearning. Within a castle of seven-fold walls and gates they lead their shadowy life, neither sad nor glad, grave and subdued in aspect, conversing still with regard to the problems of existence, knowing nothing of the present, but only of the past and future. It is the highest point of attainment for unbelievers. Here Virgil points out "the luminous habitation of the poets." Homer and Horace receive Dante into their company, and show him Socrates, Plato, and other master-spirits of antiquity. When they leave him, he re-enters the domain of darkness; passes before Minos, the infernal Judge; and now at length descends into the Hell of positive sin and of real punishment.

It will be worth our while here to pause a moment, and consider the three great divisions under which Dante classifies the sins punished in the eight circles which we have still to visit. There are, to his mind, three great types and gradations of sin. They are Incontinence, Bestiality, and Malice. But neither incontinence nor bestiality are precisely what these words would seem to indicate. Incontinence includes all sin of mere emotion and desire, of affection and feeling. Lasciviousness, gluttony, avarice and anger all belong to this category. They are sins of impulsive passion, exaggerations of principles of our nature which are themselves innocent, but which are indulged in manner or measure opposed to the will of God. It is significant that all these sins are punished in darkness, as befits the nature of them, committed as they have been with mind beclouded by passion. And the respective punishments are punishments in kind. Carnal sinners are swept along by a violent hurricane, as if to intimate that they who have sown the wind must reap the whirlwind. Gluttons lie prostrate on the ground, beneath a pelting storm of rain, snow and hail; while Cerberus, a sort of personified belly, devours them. The avaricious and the prodigal crawl in two bands in opposite directions, pushing before them great weights, which clash together as they meet, the one band howling to the other: "Why did ye keep?" and the other howling in return: "Why did ye give away?" The wrathful and gloomy are immersed naked in a lake of mud, and in this lake they strike and tear each other. There is an impressive lesson here,—anger and melancholy are punished together. Too much indignation and too little indignation are equally sins. The wrathful and the wrathless both transgress God's law. "Be ye angry, and sin not," says the Scripture. "Ye that love the Lord, hate evil." Not to be angry at unrighteousness, smoothly and indolently to condone wrong-doing, this to Dante is sin against God, and they who commit it are imbedded in the dregs of the Stygian pool.

We have been dealing with sins of feeling. How solemn a truth does the poet teach us when he makes sins of the thoughts to follow these! For this is what he means by Bestiality, the next great class of transgressions. The bestial man is the man who is besotted in mind, and who gives himself over to infidelity or to heresy; who either says with the fool: "There is no God," or says with the errorist: "God is different from what he has revealed himself to be." Here, in the flaming city of Dis, where the walls

are of iron and the darkness is mingled with fire, the arch-heretics are confined in red-hot tombs; as if to show the living death of the soul that cuts itself loose from faith in God and his revelation. Notice that this sin of bestialism or unbelief follows, and grows out of, the sin of wrong desire. The heart first departs from God, and then the intellect follows in its train. It is only an anticipation of Goethe's *dictum:* "As are the inclinations, so are the opinions." When man gives loose rein to evil affections, the eyes of his understanding are darkened. But there is something worse even than sin of the feelings and of the intellect: it is sin of consciously evil will; and so the third great class of iniquities in Dante's hell is that of Malice, in its ever-deepening forms, now of Violence, then of Fraud, and finally of Treachery. The sin of unbelief cannot maintain itself against the accusations of conscience except by becoming the sin of positive hatred and opposition to God. First the heart, then the intellect, and lastly the will, sets itself against Him who made it.

Malice is punished after its kind also. The Violent, such as tyrants, murderers and marauders, are sunk in a boiling river of blood, and as often as they emerge are shot at by the Centaurs. Such the fate of those who commit violence against others,— they have their fill of blood. Suicides, - or those who are guilty of violence against themselves, are turned into trees, whose living branches are plucked away by harpies, only to grow again. Blasphemers, or those who have done violence to God, are exposed to a slow shower of fire, upon a plain of burning sand. Below the circle where Violence is punished, at a vast depth indeed beneath, Fraud in its ten subdivisions has its place of doom. Here are seducers and flatterers, the first scourged by demons, the second immersed in filth. Simoniacs, who have purchased high places in the church with money, are fixed in circular holes, like purses, with their heads down, their legs only appearing, and the soles of their feet burnt with flames. Sorcerers or diviners, as they endeavored to pry into the future, have their heads twisted round so that they have to walk backward now. Barterers and peculators are plunged into a lake of boiling pitch. Hypocrites wear cloaks and hoods which are gilt outside, but are lined within with lead, whose heavy weight they try with groans to carry. Thieves are persecuted with a swarm of serpents. Evil counsellors are tormented in wrappings of flame that fit them as a garment. Slanderers and schismatics have their limbs miserably mangled. Alchemists and forgers are visited with an itching leprosy.

Last of all comes the well of the primeval giants, the mythical demigods who rose against Jove in arms. They are representatives of the last and deepest intensity of sin, the Malice that becomes Ingratitude, and that betrays kindred and friends, king and country, and finally its very God and Saviour. Treachery is in Dante's scheme the utmost malignity of sin, its most complete and dreadful expression. The lowest pit is called the Judecca, because it holds Judas, who betrayed his Lord. And here Judas is tormented by Satan, to whom for thirty pieces of silver he sold himself. We have reached Hell's lowest point. Let us gaze at Satan there. He is a creature of monstrous size,— Dante gives us the means of estimating very accurately his dimensions. The primeval giants are each seventy feet tall; Satan is twelve times as great — eight hundred and forty feet therefore in

height. At the very centre of the earth he sits, forever flapping his vast and bat-like wings in effort to escape, while these very movements chill the air and turn everything about him to frost and ice. He tries to escape, but every effort only freezes him more solidly into his place of imprisonment. He has three heads and three faces — red, white and black — to correspond with the three divisions of the human race which he has succeeded in leading to perdition ; in each one of his three mouths he is crunching and devouring a traitor, and of the three traitors Judas is chief. The centre of Hell is not fire but ice — fit type of the hardness and the coldness of the heart that is "past feeling." The sin of sense has become the sin of malice, and malice has deepened into treachery and positive hatred to God. Feeling led the way into transgression, but the intellect followed, and then the will gave in its conscious adhesion to wrong, until there came the spurning of the very mercy that would save, and the sin against the Holy Ghost that hath never forgiveness, either in this world or in that which is to come.

Before we leave the Inferno, it is important to note three things. The first is, that the grotesqueness and monstrosity of Dante's punishments are intended to teach a moral lesson — this namely, that sin is something essentially vile and contemptible. The "Divine Comedy" gives a very different picture of Satan, for example, from that with which we have become familiar in the "Paradise Lost." Milton's Satan is "the archangel ruined," but the emphasis seems often to lie upon the "archangel" rather than upon the "ruin"; Satan has been called, indeed, "the hero of the Paradise Lost." But Dante is resolved that no illusive glamour shall surround the great enemy. He will picture him in all his native cruelty and hatred and malignity, a creature loathsome and loathed. Milton, it is true, has passages in which the adversary confesses to an inward torment. Those three words : "Myself am hell," contain the very essence of the doctrine of future punishment. But as we see Satan striding over the burning marl, asserting himself in rebellious pride, daring the Almighty to crush him with his thunderbolts, we are forced to admire the unconquerable will that had rather rule in hell than serve in heaven. And in all this, Milton is false to Scripture. Though Dante goes beyond the Bible in his grotesque physical images, he expresses more of the spirit of the Bible than does Milton. Sin and sinners, he holds in derision. Even in the story of Francesca da Rimini we do not lose sight of the serpent that lies beneath the flowers ; guilty love has in it moral corruption and eternal despair. All Dante's demons are hateful ; no man through him shall be seduced into calling darkness light, or evil good. He declares that, just as surely as the righteous shall rise to everlasting life, the wicked shall rise to shame and everlasting contempt.

A second lesson which Dante teaches us is, that sin is the self-perversion of the will. If there is any thought fundamental to his system it is the thought of freedom. Man is not a waif swept irresistibly downward on the current ; he is a being endowed with power to resist, and therefore guilty if he yields. Sin is not misfortune, or disease, or natural necessity ; it is wilfulness, and crime, and self-destruction. The "Divine Comedy" is, beyond all other poems, the poem of Conscience ; and this it could not be, if it did not recognize man as a free agent, the responsible cause of his

own evil acts and his own evil state. And Dante is a lover of God and of holiness. He puts himself on God's side, in the great moral controversy of the ages. He explains suffering by guilt; he sees the whole race under the load of just penalty; hell is to him only the sign of God's estimate of sin. Is there anything that our age needs more than this strengthening of conscience, this assertion of the claims of righteousness, this declaration that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die?" Would that our soft and easy-going time, soothed almost to sleep as it is by the tempter's voice, "Thou shalt not surely die," and inclined to compound with almighty Justice for indulgence in all sorts of pleasurable wickedness,— would that our age might listen to the awful voices of self-accusation and despair that sound out from Dante's Hell to proclaim the voluntariness and the damnableness of sin!

Still another lesson from the Inferno is, that penalty is not in its essence external to the sinner. Here I know I shall contradict the impressions of many of my readers. "Dante not a believer in material and physical punishment?" Ah, I did not say that. I said that to Dante the material and the physical were not the *essence* of punishment. I most earnestly believe that, with all the material imagery of Dante's Hell, he never meant us to take one of these physical punishments merely in its literal sense. He believed indeed in a body, and believed that God would destroy both soul and body in hell; doubtless he expected that sins of the flesh would be punished in the flesh. But his view of sin as having its source and centre in the soul forbade him to put upon the mere body the main stress of penalty. People have made the same mistake about Jonathan Edwards. Because he speaks of the sinner as shriveling like a worm in the fire of God's judgments, some have supposed that he regarded hell as consisting mainly of such physical torments. But this is a misinterpretation of Edwards. As he did not fancy heaven to consist in streets of gold or pearly gates, but rather in the holiness and communion with Christ of which these are symbols, so he did not regard hell as consisting in fire and brimstone, but rather in the unholiness and separation from God of which fire and brimstone were symbols. He used the material imagery, because he thought that this best answered to the methods of Scripture. He probably went beyond the simplicity of the Scripture statements, and did not sufficiently explain the spiritual meaning of the symbols he used; but I am persuaded that he neither understood them literally himself, nor meant them to be so understood by others. What is true of Edwards is true of Dante. In how many ways does he show that sin is essentially a condition of soul, an alienation of the heart from God, an inner conflict and agony! It is shown by the fact that living men are represented as already in hell; as eternal life is already present in the souls of the good, so eternal death is already in the souls of the evil. It is shown by the fact that the sinner is made to punish himself; the wicked is holden in the cords of his own sins; sin is its own detecter and judge and tormentor. Dante's doctrine is ever this: "The responsible agent, man, does to himself whatever he does, and his deeds return to the doer." The material symbols are nothing more than symbols — symbols of the corruption and death which is involved in sin itself — symbols of the fact that sin tends to permanence; that sin

at last is stamped upon the soul as its eternal form; that the free will becomes at last enslaved to evil; that the sinner, apart from divine grace, tends ever downward in an ever-increasing intensity of selfish will and an ever-increasing intensity of punishment.

It is pleasant to emerge from the Inferno, even though we have learned from it so many lessons. Dante emerges under guidance of Virgil. Having passed the centre of the earth in his descent, he takes his upward way to the opposite side of the globe from that at which he entered. But the force of gravity is against him now. *Facilis descensus Averno;* and we may add: *Difficilis ascensus coelo.* By what road does he ascend? Ah, there is a channel worn through the solid earth by the stream that flows downward from the mount of Purgatory. That stream is made up of the tears of the penitents who make reparation on the mount, and whose guilt and depravity, as fast as it is purged away, flows downward to Satan from whom it came, and with whom it now abides forever. As our toil-worn pilgrim emerges from the bowels of the earth and plants his feet upon the mount of purification, the day begins to break, and the sorrow of his soul gives place to joy. He sees an angel-piloted bark approaching the island-mount, a bark which brings to Purgatory, from the banks of the Tiber, all souls which have died at peace with the Church, and who only need to be freed from the remains of sin to be fitted for heaven. Here we need to remember that in Roman Catholic doctrine, Purgatory is only a temporary abiding-place. Purgation may last for hundreds of years, but it cannot last forever. All who enter Hell go there to stay. None ever stay in Purgatory. And yet none wish to depart,—they desire only to be cleansed. They bear willingly, yes, even gladly, the chastisements of God, which are meant for their correction in righteousness. The reeds with which the shores of that island are fringed, yielding ever as they do to the swaying of the waves, are the symbol of the will of the mountain's habitants, bending ever to the slightest movement of the will of God. On this mount they bemoan their sins. It is a sweet and holy dwelling-place, irradiated by the Southern Cross, a constellation unseen in our cold northern climes; the grassy slopes are kept green by the tears of the penitents; angels visit the mount to encourage them, admonish them, guide them upward, in their toilsome striving; hymns and prayers to God are continually ascending from its terraces, as from altar-stairs; its summit is the Terrestrial Paradise, from which by a short step the soul, with the temporary shade-body which it wears till the resurrection, can rise from earth to heaven.

There is an Ante-Purgatory, just as there was an Ante-Hell. This Ante-Purgatory is under the wardenship of Cato of Utica, that model of ancient self-control. Here at the base of the mountain are detained those who deferred repentance during their former life; they are compelled to wait, outside of St. Peter's gate, a hundred years for every year of that former delay,—that is, are compelled to wait unless their stay is shortened by the pious prayers of friends whom they have left behind, one moment of whose intense intercessions has power to deliver from years of purgatorial sorrow. Voltaire said rightly that in Purgatory the church had found what Archimedes vainly longed for, a ποῦ στῶ upon which he might plant his lever to move the world. The souls in the place of preliminary trial chant the

Miserere and the Compline Hymn, and so get help against the adversary. At St. Peter's gate, Purgatory proper first begins. They approach it by a threefold stair, symbolic of the confession, contrition and satisfaction which the church requires. An angel with flaming sword keeps the door, charged to err by admitting, rather than to err by excluding, those who seek admission there; and yet there is a safeguard — he who after entering should look back, would again find himself without. Upon the brow of each one so admitted the angel with his sword of flame marks seven times the letter P,— which means *Peccatum*, *Peccavi*, and indicates that there are seven capital sins which must be successively purged away. There are seven terraces, each devoted to the purgation of one of these sins of Pride, Envy, Anger, Sloth, Avarice, Gluttony, Lasciviousness; and when the purgation of any one of these is complete, the corresponding mark of shame vanishes from the brow. So the process goes on until the forehead is pure, as at man's first creation; and, as the soul leaps up in freedom and regains once more its lost estate of innocency, the whole mount of Purgatory shakes for joy.

In the Inferno, sin grows in intensity as the circles narrow and we go downward. In Purgatory the rule is just the opposite; the greatest sins are first purged away, and the mountain narrows as we ascend. Progress upward is at the first slow and difficult, and the heights are great. But each sin removed gives new freedom; the distances grow smaller and the ascent more rapid; for "to him that hath shall be given," and when the sins that so easily beset are all laid aside, the soul "mounts up with wings as eagles;" nothing now is left to separate between it and God. There is another relation between the structure of the Purgatory and that of the Hell,— sins in both are classified under three general divisions. In the Purgatory, however, the classification is that of the mediæval theologians, into Love Distorted, Love Defective and Love Excessive. Under love distorted, pride, envy and anger are ranged — each being regarded as loving evil to one's neighbor. Love defective is represented only by sloth — this loves too little the highest good. Love excessive has three divisions: avarice, or the excessive love of money; gluttony, or the excessive love of food; lasciviousness, or the excessive love of sensual pleasure. The seven terraces around the mountain are but eighteen feet in width, for "narrow is the way that leads to life." On the one side of each is the precipice; on the other is the rocky wall, up which there is but one long and steep ascent, by stairs, to the terrace next above.

Let us delay for one moment to glance at the chastisements of the Mount of Penitence. In the first circle Pride, the primal sin, and root of all other sins, is made to suffer. The proud are bowed to the earth by heavy weights of stone placed upon their backs; and, as they move onward in long procession, their eyes lifted up no longer, they look sideways at wonderfully sculptured representations of humility upon the rocky wall, or downwards at wonderfully sculptured representations of pride upon the pavement beneath their feet; while spirit-voices chant the Lord's Prayer and "Blessed are the poor in spirit." In the second terrace the Envious are punished, by having the eyes that looked askance on others sewed up with iron thread, while mantled in prickly hair-cloth they are compelled to sit shoulder to shoulder, leaning upon one another and recognizing their mutual obligation and dependence. The eyes that have transgressed are not permitted now to

see, and so instruction is communicated to them by spirit-voices that record the various historical instances of love or of envy. "Blessed are the merciful," and "Rejoice, O victor!" are the salutations that signalize release. The third circle is devoted to the chastisement of Anger. This, too, is punished, in kind, by a dense fog — symbolic of the passion which blinds the eyes of the wrathful. The fog is bitter as smoke and black as night, and it is only in ecstatic vision that the angry souls are reminded of noble examples of forbearance, and of the murderous fruits of the opposite vice. The souls here suffering pray to the Lamb of God for mercy, and the beatitude that celebrates the completion of their purging is, "Blessed are the peacemakers."

But we must hasten up the Mount. The Slothful are punished in the fourth terrace by being forced against their nature to run races with each other; while they exercise the virtue opposite to their own failing by shouting out to each other shameful illustrations of luke-warmness and inspiring instances of diligence. Avarice, in the circle next above, is bound hand and foot; and, as it has refused to look upward to higher good, so it is now made to grovel on the earth. "My soul cleaveth unto the dust," is the cry of the penitent; and "Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness" is the sign of their victory over this their besetting sin. Then comes the circle of the Gluttonous, tormented by the tree of Tantalus, a tree that entices by its wealth of fragrant fruits, but that widens upward instead of downward, and evermore withholds the means of gratification from the famished soul. Haggard and emaciated, the gluttonous crowd about it, casting eager eyes upon its precious burden, but only to elicit from its branches urgent admonitions to temperance. In the seventh and last circle Lasciviousness is expiated by long lines of penitents who pass through a fierce flame proceeding from the rocky wall beside them. Dante and Virgil both enter into this flame. Only here, and in the third terrace where anger is punished, does Dante himself suffer with the penitents. Of two sins only, he seems to himself to need purging. And the penal fire does its work. His soul is purified from its last remaining sin. He is now master of himself, and, as a crowned and mitred sovereign, with the lost image of God restored, he enters the Terrestrial Paradise, the Eden from which man was expelled for his sin. Virgil now can no longer be his guide, and Beatrice comes to take Virgil's place, after Dante had drunk of the waters of Lethe, which extinguish the memory of the past, and of the waters of Eunoe, which bring back the memory of the good.

Amid the living verdure and the fragrant flowers, the pleasant zephyrs and the singing birds, we would gladly linger. There are two remarks, however, which I must make with regard to Dante's Purgatory, before I leave it. And the first is that, like the Hell, Dante does not regard it as a place, so much as it is a process. Doubtless he believed in the place, and sought to give an imaginative picture of it. But much more he believed in the thing — the necessity of purification. "Without holiness no man can see the Lord;" "put to death the deeds of the flesh;" "cleanse yourselves, therefore, from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit,"— these are the essential truths which were in Dante's mind. The Christian doctrine of sanctification is put into verse in Dante's poem, and so far, both Protestant and Romanist may find in it a source of great religious incitement and profit.

Indeed, the Purgatory comes nearer to our common life than either the Hell or the Paradise. The former is too far beneath us, and the latter is too far above. But every man can recognize resemblance to himself in the penitents of Purgatory,—that is, if he have even a spark of the hatred of sin and longing for holiness which God's regenerating Spirit has inspired. The tender and humble confessions of the sufferers, their submission to the divine chastisements, their eager appropriation of all helps to their restoration which are bestowed by the word or the Spirit of God, are full of subduing beauty. Nowhere in literature, outside of the Bible, have we so nobly portrayed "the blessedness of him whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered."

This first remark about Purgatory has had to do with that which Roman Catholicism and Protestantism have in common. My second remark has to do with the differences between them. There are two respects in which Protestants must regard Dante's representations as painfully erroneous. On the one hand he errs, as the Roman Catholic Church has erred, in extending the period of purification beyond the confines of death. The literal interpretation is better. Purgatory is only on this earth, and in this life. "After death," there is, not purification, but "judgment." For multitudes, the Romanist doctrine is a doctrine of second probation. Men are content here with being at peace with the Church, while they are not yet at peace with God. The real controversy between themselves and their Judge is adjourned to the future world. Purgatory, with all its sufferings, becomes the basis of false hopes; distant suffering is chosen rather than immediate renunciation of sin; a fatal trust is put, in what the sinner can do by way of reparation, rather than in what Christ has done by way of atonement. And this leads me to notice another error intimately connected with that which I have just mentioned, and which Protestants must ever most strenuously oppose. I refer now to Dante's error in making the process of purification a penal one. If there be any truth of Scripture more vital and precious than another it is that of the completeness of Christ's sacrifice. Our sins, and all of them, were "laid on him;" he "has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" "there is therefore now no condemnation to them who are in Jesus Christ." God chastises his children; but it is in love, and it is for their good. There is no anger and there is no penalty, since "Jesus paid it all, all the debt we owe, and nothing either great or small remains for us to do." The notion that the sufferings and calamities of the present life are of the nature of punishment, is contrary to the whole doctrine of the New Testament, and constitutes "a bridge to the Roman Catholic doctrine of purgatorial fires." Neither in this world, nor in the world to come, can any mortal add, by penance of his own, to the efficacy of that sacrifice of Christ which was offered once for all. Dante was not in advance of his age, nor was he yet possessed of the spirit of the Lutheran Reformation. Justification by faith alone had not yet dawned upon him as God's only way of salvation. The "mass" to him was still a repetition of Christ's death, and the pains of Purgatory, voluntarily endured by the penitent, were still needed to supplement what Christ had done upon the cross.

So at last we come to Dante's Paradise, a creation in some respects loftier and more wonderful than either the Hell or the Purgatory, yet, for the very

reason that it is so lofty and wonderful, less attractive than either of these to the ordinary mind. Still, as we read the poet's sublime meditations upon the greatest truths of religion and philosophy, we are impressed with the self-sufficiency of his genius. Never, even in its highest soaring, does the wing of his imagination seem to flag. Or, if ever earthly pictures seem to fail and earthly words are incapable of expressing the "exceeding and eternal weight of glory," piety and worship furnish what art cannot supply, and the glowing heart of the poet shows itself most manifestly lost in adoration and in joy. Heaven, we must remember, is to Dante's mind the state of the perfected will; or, rather, the state of the will that has been freed at length from earthly and sensual desires. But while perfection in the sense of sinlessness belongs to all the inhabitants of the blessed realm, perfection in the sense of capacity is ever enlarging. All are as full as they can hold of the love and purity of God, yet one can hold more than another. To use the mediæval illustration: "A king may clothe all his children equally with cloth of gold, yet the amount of the cloth apportioned to each may vary according to their size." In heaven, too, as well as in the lower realms, each soul goes to his own place.

Outward surroundings are simply the fit accompaniments and evidences of character. As the soul laden with sin experiences a downward, so the soul possessed of purity experiences an upward, gravitation; and each one can say with King Richard in Shakespeare's play: "Mount, mount, my soul, — thy seat is up on high!" As we press upward then from one heavenly sphere to another, we are to remember that we are not among the race of sinners any longer,— we are rather among those whose varying native gifts, and whose varying degrees of faithfulness in the exercise of these gifts, constitute an ever-varying receptivity for the life and love of God.

Beatrice, the symbol of heavenly wisdom, is now Dante's guide. As he gazes upon her face, the light of the terrestial paradise is lost in another light. "Suddenly day seemed added unto day, as if Omnipotence had lit up the sky with another sun." The poet is lifted up from earth to heaven. And yet it is the lowest heaven which first he visits — the heaven of the moon, with its waxing and waning, the proper home of those whose wills on earth were imperfect through instability. Here are nuns, who, being constrained to marry, did not return to their vows when they had opportunity. This sphere is revolved by the Angels. The next sphere is that of Mercury, and Archangels have it in charge, turning it in due order around the earth and the sphere of the moon which it encloses. In this sphere of Mercury abide those whose wills were on earth imperfect through love of fame — men of great activity and eloquence, who lived on the whole for God, yet at the same time had some regard to the praise of men. Then comes the sphere of Venus, revolved by the Principalities, and fitly made the home of those whose wills on earth were imperfect through excess of human love, even though that love was in itself lawful. Here Dante is led to

> "admire the Art that turns to good
> Such passion, and the Wisdom manifold
> Whence earthly love by heavenly is subdued."

Thence he is lifted to the Sun, the fourth heaven, revolved by the Powers. Here in this chief light of the material universe, I am happy to observe

that he places the abode of doctors of divinity and philosophy, probably because they have themselves been sources of light to the Church. The sphere of Mars, to which the poet next ascends, is revolved by the Virtues. Here he sees the forms of distinguished warriors, confessors, and martyrs for the faith, not drawn up in the order of an earthly army but ranged together in the shape of a cross. Then comes the sphere of Jupiter, of which the Dominations have control. Here rulers eminent for justice are disposed in the shape of an eagle; and wonderful to tell, the Eagle, collective representation of earth's noblest kings and potentates, itself finds a voice, and speaks to Dante of the greater things of the divine kingdom. In the planet Saturn, or seventh heaven, revolved by the Thrones, are found contemplative spirits, or those who have furnished the most illustrious examples of the monastic life. The cold sphere of Saturn is peculiarly adapted to the monks and hermits who have resigned the warmth of the fireside and the fervors of civic life, in order to give themselves to prayer and to the study of heavenly truth. The heaven of the fixed stars comes next, for Dante knew of no planet beyond Saturn. Here the Cherubim move the sphere, and the apostles and saints of the Old and of the New Testaments have their dwelling. And here, before he is permitted to ascend higher, Dante passes an examination on the subject of Faith, Hope and Love, — St. Peter, St. James and St. John successively conducting it. When he has shown himself expert in these prerequisites to heavenly bliss, the poet is carried up to the ninth, or highest heaven, revolved by the Seraphim. This sphere is called the *Primum Mobile*, because its motion is most rapid, and is the cause of motion to all the spheres which it encloses. This highest heaven is starless and crystalline; and here "the nine orders of the celestial hierarchy circle in fiery rings around the Light which no man can approach unto, manifested as an Atomic Point."

Dante has reached the summit of being, and is permitted to gaze upon its uncreated Source. A stream of light proceeds from God himself. In that light the multitude of saints and angels find their blessedness.

> "And as a cliff looks down upon the bed
> Of some clear stream, to see how richly crowned
> With flowers and foliage is its lofty head,
> So all from earth who hither e'er returned,
> Seated on more than thousand thrones around,
> Within the Eternal Light themselves discerned."

It is the "Rose of the Blessed" — the great company of the redeemed, circling, like the petals of a rose, rank beyond rank, around the mystical lake of light which reflects that "Light which no man hath seen or can see." The saints of all ages are here, from Adam to St. Paul, and from the Virgin Mary to Beatrice. All the praises which Dante has hitherto lavished upon the lady of his love fail now, he says, to give any adequate conception of her loveliness, as with him she ascends to the highest heaven. But his love is now no merely earthly love, — he has learned the lesson that "our loves in higher love endure." Love for God draws him nearer to Beatrice, and conversely, love for Beatrice draws him nearer to God. His eyes, and all eyes, are supremely set on the Highest of all — the triune God, — into partnership with whom our humanity has been taken, in the person of the Son, and whose Trinity in Unity is now unfolded to the adoring contempla-

tion of his creatures. At the intercession of St. Bernard, Dante is enabled with purified sight to gaze directly upon the Supreme Jehovah, and is moved to pray that grace may be given him so to utter what he sees, that generations to come may catch some glimpse of the sublime vision :

"O Sovereign Light! who dost exalt thee high
Above all thoughts that mortal may conceive,
Recall thy semblance to my mental eye,
And let my tongue record the wondrous story,
That I to nations yet unborn may leave
One spark at least of thy surpassing glory!"

But the light transcends all powers of description. Only one thing is made plain — and that the greatest thing of all — in God, Light and Love are one :

"The glorious vision here my powers o'ercame ;—
But now my will and wish were swayed by Love—
(As turns a wheel on every side the same)
Love — at whose word the sun and planets move."

So ends the Divine Comedy. The translation of Wright, which I have generally used because it best represents the rhythm and rhyme of the original, is in these last lines in one respect defective,— it does not put at the end the word with which Dante meant his poem to close. That word is the "stars." With this word he ends the Inferno :

"Emerging, we once more beheld the stars."

With this word he ends the Purgatorio :

"And with a will endued to mount the stars."

With this word he ends also the Paradiso :

"The Love that moves the sun and the other stars."

We can now see how narrow and unintelligent that criticism is which represents Dante's poetry as savage and grotesque, and regards the poet as capable only of rough effects. The truth is that Dante is of all poets the most sensitive to the changeful aspects of nature ; every hour of the day or the night has to him its peculiar beauty ; no poet ever read in the book of nature more spiritual lessons ; no poet ever expressed those lessons in more varied and melodious phrase. When the boys of the street saw him go by, they said : "There goes the man that was in Hell!"—and there was in his countenance a solemn gravity which gave verisimilitude to the popular report. But Dante did not revel in horrors, as some imagine. It was his instinct of righteousness, and not a morbid disposition to gloat over suffering, that furnished the *animus* of his dark descriptions of the torments of the lost. He had an enthusiasm for justice,— but then he had also a soul tremulously sensitive to the least of earth's sorrows, and to all those benignant agencies by which God would remedy them. Dante was thorough-going. He saw the depth of man's need ; he saw the grandeur of the heavenly discipline. He did not waste his fervors on sin or sinners ; he reserved those for struggling purity, and for God's plan of rescue and restoration. Dante is the most ethical of poets,— he measures all things by the standard of the Sanctuary. But all beauty that is real or lasting — all moral beauty, in short — wakes in Dante's soul responsive emotions, and finds a calm and sweet expression in his verse.

Take for example the poet's ruling conception of heaven. It is that of

light — light qualified by love. No language upon earth has such a marvelous wealth of terms expressive of the varying shades and aspects of light as has the Italian. And the most of these it owes to Dante. He not only pressed into service every word his native Italian furnished, but he revived scores of words which slept in the Latin classics; and, when these would not suffice, he coined yet others from the mint of his own brain. This was no fanaticism of sensuous delight; it was the struggle of a great nature to express moral truth through the poor vehicle of human speech. There rang forever in his ears that sounding and sublime sentence: "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." In the Paradise, when all other earthly images fail him to describe the state of the redeemed, he represents their blessedness under the figure of ever-new intensities and splendors of the light. The saints are "light in the Lord"; they have "awaked, and risen from the dead, and Christ has given them light." So the "light" is the light of truth, of purity, of holiness — the opposite to that "darkness," which is error and impurity and sin. As God himself is light, and dwells in the light which is unapproachable, so each successive rise in the scale of being is a rise from one degree of light to another, — not a merely physical and passive elevation either, since it is the mind and heart and will into which and through which "the true light now shineth." No Mohammedan Paradise is here, but only the Paradise which consists in holiness and in likeness to God. The poet who could thus resist the sensuous and externalizing influences of the Church of his day must not only have drunk deep of a nobler than Pierian spring — even the well of Holy Scripture — but must have been specially guided and enlightened by the Holy Spirit of God.

In another respect Dante's Paradise is worthy of the highest praise. It represents nearness to God and service to God's creatures as contemporaneous. Rank in God's creation is determined by the clearness of the soul's vision of God — here the mystical and contemplative element in religion has its rights accorded to it. But the ascetic exaggerations of this truth, which had so infected the life of the church, Dante is almost wholly a stranger to. He writes from the point of view, not of the monk, but of the common Christian. Exceedingly few of the so-called saints of the Roman Catholic calendar does he deign to notice; the more healthful Scriptural examples of chastity and faith and endurance are strewn thickly over his pages. And then, most remarkable of all, he has made the nine heavens, with all their higher and lower spheres, only the working-places of the redeemed; while their working-places are below, their dwelling-places are on high, in the mystical White Rose which is above all time and space, around the mystical lake of light, where there is no need of sun or moon, because God and the Lamb are the light of it. All the saints dwell in the light of God's immediate presence, and according to their capacity are made to reflect that light. But just in proportion to the light which they are able to receive, just in proportion to their nearness to God and the clearness of their vision of him, is the service they are permitted to render others. At the same time that they worship above, they have an existence and perform a service in the universe of time and space. The highest of them can help God's creatures in the heaven of the fixed stars; the lowest of them can help those who are just beginning their course in the heaven of the moon.

It is not worth our while to stop here and smile at Dante, until we ponder those words of our Lord from which the poet, it may be, derived the suggestion of his thought: "See that ye despise not one of these little ones, for in heaven their angels do alway behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." What is this but to say: Heaven and earth are not mutually exclusive. Angels — and if angels, why not redeemed men? — by so much as they are near to God, by so much do they busy themselves in service to God's creatures. Heaven is no refuge of idleness; no hands hang down, and no lips are dumb. "His servants shall serve him." Knowledge of God and service to men are contemporaneous and interdependent. The nearer we get to God, the larger shall be our sphere of loving activity; the more shall we resemble him, who, though he was the very son of God and in the very bosom of the Father, yet was among us "as one that serveth."

So holiness is joined to love, and holiness and love together constitute Dante's heaven. It is beautiful to see how, in the Paradise, all heaven rejoices over the new joy of each victorious and ascending spirit, and how increasing nearness to God brings its inhabitants ever nearer to each other. Even the ministrants in the upper temple get new understanding of the wonders of God's grace, and take on a new brightness of holy love, as they see Dante enter heaven. It was with such thoughts as these that the exile soothed the long years of his poverty and disappointment. Who can wonder that to him the spiritual world became at last more real than the material world that was open to his senses! It is sometimes made matter of complaint against him that his representations were so matter of fact; that his journey through Hell, Purgatory and Heaven was so real a journey; that its incidents were so like the incidents of actual experience. Ah, this is the wonder and the poetry of it! Imagination and piety created a new world. Just so did John Bunyan, in Bedford jail, turn from the earthly to the heavenly, from the seen to the unseen, from the temporal to the eternal. He not only *saw* Christian making his way from the City of Destruction to the Heavenly City, but he *was* Christian. So Dante's vividness of description is not mere literary art; it is a deeper process than that,— it is a living through the things which he described, so that he could say: *Quorum magnaque pars fui.*

It is this intense realism which gives the Divine Comedy its chief power. It is the utterance of the greatest man of his time, and one of the greatest men of all times. It is his conscientious and God-fearing attempt to express the truth of God as his generation apprehended it, and so to express it that it might influence all after ages to turn from error and iniquity to truth and righteousness. Thomas Carlyle has called Dante "the mouth-piece of the middle ages." The German Tieck declares that in him "ten silent centuries found a voice." This seems high praise, but Dante deserves higher praise than this. He is the mouth-piece, not only of the middle ages, but of all ages. Not twelve centuries, but all the centuries, find a voice in him. He illustrates truths that are true, not only then, but now and always — truths of sin and purgation and recovery to righteousness, truths for the expression of which God spread the floor of the universe with its mosaic of constellations, and caused the curtain of night and chaos to rise at the creation.

"The corruption of the will, the purification of the will, the perfection of the will"—these are Dante's themes; and, as they are the greatest themes of all, so they are themes the most deeply affecting and the most permanently inspiring. Like Mary's breaking of the alabaster box, this offering of Dante to Beatrice, wherever the gospel goes, will be spoken of for a memorial of her. But it will be a memorial of something higher still, even of that higher love which spoke through the love of Beatrice, the love of the Triune God to a humanity that was sunk and lost in its sin. For this reason the poem of Dante will never die. Dante's universe has changed. In the midst of the Western hemisphere modern discovery has found, not the Mount of Purgatory, but a vast new continent. Our earth is no longer the centre of the solar system,—it is a satellite of the sun instead. But the great truths of being—these remain just what they were in Dante's time; and the Divine Comedy will be immortal, because it is the grandest utterance yet given by man to these universal and fundamental principles in the nature of man and the nature of God.

XLIX.

POETRY AND ROBERT BROWNING.*

It is a serious question whether this article would ever have been written, if I had not awhile ago seen Robert Browning — not in the flesh, but in the Watts Collection. I do not refer to the Collection of Isaac Watts, valuable as that collection is, but to that of George Frederick Watts, who puts his poetry upon canvas instead of coining it into song. Many critics regard this particular Watts as the best modern reviver of the color and the ideality of the Venetian masters. A considerable number of his pictures were exhibited at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. There was "Love and Death"— a rosy boy, with appealing look, vainly striving to press back from the threshold a veiled and sombre form that trampled under his feet the flowers falling from Love's fingers. There was "Love and Life"— a noble, masculine figure helping a fainting maiden along a rocky, precipitous path, the lesson being this, that life cannot get on without love. There was "Time, Death, and Judgment"— Time, an immortal youth ; Death, a solemn, dusky shape ; both wading through a deep stream, while Judgment, with flaming sword, followed close behind.

These three were all of them great pictures — great because they bodied forth ideal truth and gave it power over the heart. But the portraits of the Collection were more impressive still. The realistic method was never more rigidly applied. Each subject was treated in its own way. The artist had seized the central feature of each personality, and had set it forth so vividly and powerfully that the living man stood revealed before you in lineaments never to be forgotten. There was Lord Lawrence, a swarthy face against a lurid background, as if just emerging from the smoke and flame and blood of the Indian Mutiny. There was Sir Frederick Leighton, President of the Royal Academy, all elegance and jollity, as if he cared not a fig whether his special school of painting kept or not. There was John Stuart Mill, cold and intellectual, as if meditating whether in some distant star like Sirius two and two might not possibly make five. There was John Lothrop Motley, the very pink of a literary aristocrat. There was Cardinal Manning, all scarlet and lace, all dignity and devotion, but with an ascetic air that seemed to say he had not had a good meal of victuals since he entered the Roman Church. There was Thomas Carlyle, biting through his under-lip for very grouliness. There was Swinburne, a pert little counter-jumper, with red hair flying all abroad, as if he had just received a shock of electricity. There was Alfred Tennyson, with melancholy and self-consciousness only slightly relieved by the remembrance of his elevation to the House of Lords. And

*A Lecture delivered at Wellesley College, May, 1886; printed in the Examiner, December, 1887.

there, finally, was Robert Browning, healthy, robust, sagacious, subtle; seemingly a large-minded cotton-manufacturer rather than a retail vender of "Red-cotton Night-caps"; with good humor, knowledge of affairs, insight into character, determination to express what he saw; but as for "the soul of melody," "singing as the bird sings," or anything sensuous, sentimental, or purely artistic, why it was simply not there. Philosopher, critic of life, man of the world? Yes. But, poet? Well, if so, not one of the common sort. Not Tennyson's "The poet in a golden clime was born," but Emerson's "The free winds told him what they knew," is the verse to describe him. Yet when I saw the portrait, I felt that I had new light thrown upon all that Browning ever wrote. The *man* interpreted his *work*. I recognized a new species of the genus 'poet'— one who has made a sort of poetry so entirely his own that we shall have to pull down our barns and build greater, or else construct an Annex to our old scheme of classification, in order to make room for him and take him in.

That Robert Browning is a great writer, the story of his life sufficiently demonstrates. Born in 1812, he was graduated at the London University before reaching the age of twenty. He then spent some years south of the Alps, rummaging about in the libraries of old monasteries and inspecting the pictures of old cathedrals, till Walter Savage Landor could truly say that Browning never strikes a false note when he treats of Italy. *Pauline* was his first printed poem; *Paracelsus*, published in 1836, his first tragedy. His *Strafford* was represented upon the stage, and failed, though Macready took the principal rôle, in 1837. He married Elizabeth Barrett in 1846, and Mrs. Browning died in 1861. During all these and the following years Mr. Browning has been a prolific writer. As many as ten thick volumes attest his industry. Yet he has never caught the popular ear,— he has never tried to catch it. His productions have had to make their way against storms of criticism, but they have been read by a continually increasing number of thoughtful people. Whatever the student of literature may think of Browning, he must take account of the fact that never before was there a writer of verse for the study of whose writings during his life-time clubs were formed in every large city of both hemispheres — the proceedings of some of these clubs being regularly published, like the transactions of learned societies. Here is at least a literary phenomenon. There are two possible explanations: Either Robert Browning is a plausible pretender, or he is a great poet. Is Robert Browning a great poet? Well, "that depends." We must know what poetry is, and what Robert Browning is. I shall treat my reader, therefore, to a definition of poetry which, however defective in other respects it may be, will, at least, have the merit of being brand-new. I shall then weigh Robert Browning in these new balances, and see whether he is found wanting.

Poetry is the imaginative reproduction of the universe, in its ideal relations, and the expression of these relations in rhythmical literary form. The meaning of this definition will more fully appear if we say concretely that the poet is, first, a creator; secondly, an idealizer; and, thirdly, a literary artist. Take the first of these. There is a creative element in all true poetry. The poet is etymologically a "maker," not in the sense in which God is the Maker of all, but in the secondary sense, that he shapes into new forms the

material made ready to his hand. Browning has himself furnished us with a noble description of this office of the imagination :

> " I find first
> Writ down for very A B C of fact:
> 'In the beginning God made heaven and earth.'
> . . . . . .
> Man — as befits the made, the inferior thing —
> . . . . . .
> Repeats God's process, in man's due degree,
> Attaining man's proportionate result;
> Creates? no, but resuscitates, perhaps. . . . .
> For such man's feat is, in the due degree,
> Mimic creation, galvanism for life—
> But still a glory portioned in the scale."

Still further on in the same work from which we have quoted (*The Ring and the Book*, I : 706–741), the author compares this manipulation of fact by the imagination to the adding of alloy when the gold is made into a ring.

We must remember, however, that this creative function is to be clearly distinguished from that power of the mind which merely recalls the past. The reproductive faculty is not simply the representative faculty. Imagination is not memory. Every woman can write one novel ; she remembers one story — her own, and she can tell that. But "the vision and the faculty divine" that can evolve a hundred stories, all true to life and throbbing with emotion, how rare a thing is this ! Byron shows the narrowness of his creative powers, when everywhere, on the Alps or on the Rhine, in Greece, or Spain, or Italy, he sees only himself, — Manfred and the Giaour, Childe Harold, and Don Juan, are all Byron, under different names and various thin disguises. Not so with Shakespeare. The greatness of the master appears in nothing so much as in this, that in Shakespeare you see everybody and everything, but Shakespeare himself. So Browning hides his own personality. Only twice that I remember, in all his writings, does he speak in his own name ; first, in that magnificent tribute to his living wife, *One Word More ;* and, secondly, at the close of his Introduction to *The Ring and the Book*, in which he almost apotheosizes his wife, now dead. There is indeed a couplet in the opening lines of *The Inn Album*, which reads :

> " That bard's a Browning ! he neglects the form :
> But ah, the sense, ye gods, the weighty sense ! "

But even here Browning is not speaking in the first person, — in fact, it is not Browning who is speaking at all, but rather one of Browning's *dramatis personæ*, though it is of Browning that he speaks. It still remains true that Browning deals with the *non-ego*, not with the *ego* in the sense of self.

I have called poetry the imaginative reproduction of the universe. But I have not meant to limit the word "universe" to its technical theological meaning. I have meant it to include all, even God himself. Only by giving to the term this infinite sweep of significance, do we gain the proper conception of the dignity of poetry. It is nothing less than the reproduction to the imagination, of all being, all beauty, all truth — in short, of all things visible or invisible. The high praises of God are its noblest province, but all the world of finite things is its province also. To reproduce all this to the imagination would require an infinite mind, and the result would be the poetry of the ages, the poetry of eternity. If this be the meaning of the

word "universe," then it is certain that no mortal poet can compass it. Hence the poet must make his choice; he must divide, in order to conquer. It is not to his discredit that he takes a limited field, provided within those limits he "holds the mirror up to nature" and shows us the essential truth of things. In order to judge Browning justly, then, we must ask what range he has assigned himself, and whether within that range he shows himself possessed of a great creative imagination.

The most obvious thing to be said about Browning's genius is that he is the poet, not of nature, but of man. Wordsworth was the poet of nature. To him the world was sacred, because symbolic, and interfused with a divine element. The "light of setting suns," and "the billows rolling evermore" — these kindled his poetic imagination.

> "To me the meanest flower that blows can give
> Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

> "The meadow, grove, and stream,
> The earth, and every common sight,
> To me did seem
> Apparelled in celestial light,
> The glory and the freshness of a dream."

Now all this affords the utmost contrast to Browning's poetry. I doubt whether sentiments like these can be found in all the dozen solid volumes that bear his name. Browning and Wordsworth both deal with common things; but Wordsworth treats of nature, Browning of life. The latter could adopt Pope's line, "The proper study of mankind is man." And in the introduction to *Sordello*, where our author has most clearly indicated the direction of his literary ambition, he says in plain prose: "My stress lay on the incidents in the development of a soul."

Again, Browning is the poet, not of events, but of thoughts. He cares, not so much for the result, as for the process. He describes, not so much incidents, as people's impressions of them. Some might perhaps think that in the *Bringing of the Good News from Ghent to Aix*, we had at least one exception to this rule; but even here, the interest lies not so much in the ride as in the rider; not so much in the redoubtable steed as in the fiery determination that spurred him on; not so much in the deliverance itself as in the thoughts of the deliverer. Rarely, if ever, has this writer's verse any tinge of the objective, much less of the epic. On the other hand, he lets us into the secrets of the heart. As he sets before us *Bishop Blougram's Apology* for holding great ecclesiastical preferments while all real faith in the doctrines he was set to defend has gone out of him, we see "all the recesses and windings of an acute but mean and peddling little soul." As we hear the duke calmly describe his villanous treatment of *My Last Duchess*, it is difficult to say which we most shudder at, the speaker's icy cruelty, or his unconsciousness of it. No poet has more clearly taught that "out of the heart are the issues of life," and that "as a man thinketh, so is he." No poet has more powerfully depicted the self-perpetuating sin of the thoughts, or has given more impressive illustrations of the necessity of "bringing every thought into captivity," if we would make the least pretense to virtue.

Once more, Browning's poetry is, not lyric, but dramatic. He does not

himself describe men's thoughts, but he makes men describe their own. In one of his poems he rebukes a brother poet for "speaking naked thoughts, instead of draping them in sights and sounds." In the *Spanish Cloister*, the malicious, cursing monk involuntarily sets before us the character and life of the gentle and kindly brother whom he hates; so that, though the latter never utters a word for himself, the very cursing of his enemy becomes his justification and his monument. The little poem entitled *Confessions* contains a startling revelation of the heart. It is the last words of a dying man. He will have nothing to do with the clergyman who comes to give him spiritual consolation. He fastens his eyes on the medicine-bottles upon the table, and his imagination turns even them into a picture of a darling sin of his youth, and gloats over the remembered transgression, even though the next moment is to usher him into the presence of God. All this reminds me of a historical incident related by Mrs. Charles, in her book entitled The Diary of Kitty Trevylyan. John Nelson, the Methodist preacher of England, was converted by means of a dream. He saw the great white throne set, and the myriads gathered of earth and heaven. The Judge sat silent, but before him was an open book. Up to that book came one by one in long procession every soul of all mankind, and as each advanced he tore open his breast as a man would tear open the bosom of his shirt, and then compared his heart with the commandments written in the book. Not a word was said, nor did the Judge lift his finger; but each man, according as his heart agreed or disagreed with that perfect standard, went with joy to the company of the saved, or in despair to the company of the damned. Sin became its own detecter and judge and tormentor. So, as we read Robert Browning, we become aware that a process of self-revelation is going on. We seem to have naked souls before us. We look into the heart of man, and into the Day of Judgment.

Now, granting to our author his peculiar and chosen department, namely, *man;* his aspect of that segment of the universe, namely, *thought;* and, finally, his method of treatment, the *dramatic;* we ask once more, Is Browning a great creative genius? I think no one who has attentively and sympathetically read such poems as *Karshish*, *Andrea del Sarto*, *The Flight of the Duchess*, *Dis Aliter Visum*, *The Statue and the Bust*, *By the Fireside*, *Master Hugues*, *Evelyn Hope*, can refrain from answering in the affirmative. But none of these, after all, give more than fragmentary evidences of his power. The greatest work of Robert Browning is unquestionably *The Ring and the Book*. A sort of personality invests this acknowledgment of mine, and I make it partly by way of reparation, for fifteen years ago I began to read this production of the poet, but allowed myself to be daunted by the roughness and obscurity of its opening pages. I threw it down, determined to read no more. For ten years I kept my vow. Beginning then with something easier, I found to my surprise that Browning was comprehensible. A summer vacation devoted to *The Ring and the Book* converted me to a qualified admirer of the poet. Now, after further study of his writings, I regard this poem as the greatest work of creative imagination that has appeared since the time of Shakespeare.

I wish to justify this statement, which to many will seem so extraordinary. I can only do so by briefly describing *The Ring and the Book*. It is

founded upon the story of an old Italian murder. Count Guido, after having passed his youth in the service of the Pope, and having failed to secure the advancement that he sought, determines in disgust to retire to his dilapidated castle and his ancestral estate. He bethinks him, however, that an addition to his meagre income will be desirable, and he manages, with that end in view, to marry the reputed daughter of an aged and well-to-do couple of the middle class, and to take her with him. Her parents follow her, and, being ill-treated by him, leave his house in wrath. They then make known the fact that their reputed daughter is no daughter of theirs, but the offspring of a courtesan. Count Guido, in revenge, pursues toward his wife a course of relentless cruelty. He would drive her from him, yet in such a way as to throw the blame on her. A young priest is filled with pity for this double victim of avarice and malice — so young, so pure, so miserable — and he helps her to escape and to make her way to her so-called father's house in Rome. Thither Count Guido pursues her, and on a certain Christmas Eve bursts in with hired assassins, and fatally stabs the father, the mother, and herself. The Count is apprehended, tried, and executed.

It is this story upon which Browning has rung the changes in *The Ring and the Book*. First, we have the bare facts narrated — 1,400 lines. Secondly, we have the story as one-half of Rome tells it, said one part taking the part of the husband — 1,500 lines. Thirdly, what the other half of Rome said, taking the side of the wife — 1,700 lines. Fourthly, *Tertium Quid* — what the few, the elite, the cultured, the Cardinals said — 1,600 lines. Fifthly, what Count Guido himself said — 2,000 lines. Sixthly, what the brave young priest said, who fled with the Count's wife — 2,100 lines. Seventhly, what the young wife herself said, during the short hours between the attack and her death — 1,800 lines. Eighthly, what the counsel for the defence said at the trial — 1,800 lines. Ninthly, what the counsel for the prosecution said at that same trial — 1,600 lines. Tenthly, what the Pope said, to whom the case was referred for final decision — 2,100 lines. Eleventhly, what Count Guido said in prison before he was beheaded — 2,400 lines. Twelfthly, what the world said when all was over — 900 lines.

A most audacious and weary specimen of literary trifling, the reader will be apt to say. Not so. Each new telling of the story adds new incident and sheds new light. The effect is stereoscopic,— you see the facts from ever new points of view. Little by little the real truth is evolved from the chaos of testimony ; little by little the real motives of the actors become manifest. As the process goes on you catch yourself speculating about each of the *dramatis personæ*, as if he were a character in real life. The complexity of human motive, the wonderful interaction of character and circumstance, the vastness of the soul — all these begin to dawn upon you. Men are both better and worse than they know : only God can judge the heart. I know of no poem in all literature in which the greatness of human nature so looms up before you, or which so convinces you that a whole heaven or a whole hell may be wrapped up in the compass of a single soul. And, as for the separate figures, I know not where to find characters more original or more distinct, than that of Guido, with a selfishness that makes sun, moon, and stars revolve about him, and when foiled, turns to desperate malignity ; or

Pompilia, the white lily grown out of the horse-pond scum, unstained even in the midst of cruelty and misery; or Caponsacchi, the pleasure-loving soul, turned to a hero by one resolve of daring and self-sacrifice; or the grand old Pope, rounding out a just life, and preparing to go before God's judgment-bar, by doing one last act of justice and judgment upon earth. There are those who think this poem great only in its length,—and it cannot be denied that it gives the impression of inexhaustible fertility. But such critics can scarcely have read the poem through. The learning, the thought, the general conception — these are as remarkable as the length; and taking them all together, I am persuaded that the generations to come will regard *The Ring and the Book*, in the mere matter of creative genius, as the greatest poetical work of this generation.

The strongest and most flattering thing that can be said about Robert Browning has been said already. We have found him to possess in an eminent degree the first and most important characteristic of the true poet, creative genius. But there is a second standard by which he must be tried. Is the idealizing element as highly developed in him? Poetry is the imaginative reproduction, not of the actual, but of the ideal universe. The great poet, then, must be able to idealize. His imagination, creative though it may be, must not find its affinities in the bad, the morally indifferent, or the merely actual. It must hold high converse with the true, the beautiful, and the good. The poet must be one of

> "The immortal few
> Who, to the enraptured soul and ear and eye,
> Teach beauty, virtue, truth, and love, and melody."

Let me make this plain by a few contrasts. Imagination is not enough to make a poet. I once had a classmate who had a vivid imagination,—the trouble was that his imagination all ran to snakes. Of words descriptive of creeping and slimy things — centipedes, scorpions, and toads — he had a rare supply; and the imaginative power displayed in his occasional objurgations was something impressive. But I never called him a poet. Somewhat similarly, there is an imagination that runs by instinct to the morally bad, that seems to love the low and the vile for its own sake; or, if not this, is possessed with the notion — a notion born of a pantheistic philosophy — that everything that *is* has a sort of sacredness and value, and therefore is to be faithfully represented in literature. And so we have Zola's studies of morbid anatomy, and his minute depicting of the festering plague-spots of humanity. Of a somewhat better sort are the novels of Henry James — novels with no moral purpose; novels, in fact, that scout a moral purpose as foreign to true art. Mr. James seems to fancy that his business is simply to set before us studies of actual society and manners,—he would photograph modern life.

I find the same moral indifferentism in George Eliot,—I can even trace the stream back to Goethe. George Eliot's description of Dinah, the Methodist preacher, would almost convince you that the author knew the blessedness of such a Christian experience and was writing of it out of her own heart. But soon she lapses from that high strain, and a critical word suggests to us that all this has been described only as a peculiar side or aspect of human life; her interest in it is purely artistic and æsthetic, not the

warmth of real sympathy. So too in *Wilhelm Meister* — that "menagerie of tame creatures"— does Goethe, after taking his youthful charge through the sensualisms of the green-room and the strolling theatre, introduce him, as a necessary part of his education, to an example of exalted piety. The "Confessions of a Beautiful Soul," interjected into this immoral book, are simply proof that Goethe had no real belief in moral distinctions, and regarded evil as a necessary condition and accompaniment of the development of good.

Now, in contrast to all this tendency in our modern literature, I stand for the thesis that poetry is not a mere representation of life. Pre-Raphaelite studies of nature are not worthy the name of poetry. Art is not photography, and photography is not art. The ideal element must be seized and exhibited, or we have no poetry. We want to see the good in low surroundings, and we want to see the evil, only as a foil and contrast to the good. "Poetry," as Ruskin has well said, "presents to us noble grounds for the noble emotions." We seek in poetry for the essential truth and beauty that lie at the heart of things. Bluer skies than those of Italy, brighter wit than that of Sydney Smith, higher thought than that of Plato — these we seek and expect in poetry. We look to her to lift us from the dull realm of the actual into the "great air" of the ideal.

Of Browning as an idealizer, I cannot say so much as I said when I spoke of him as a creator. And yet a striking feature of his poetry is its recognition of this higher element in human life. To him all men are in a true sense ideal beings. There is a germ of greatness in every soul — continents that no Columbus has ever yet discovered — thoughts and motives, feelings and decisions, that possess interest beyond that of the whole material universe. Browning would not have chosen for his subject the soul of man, if he had not sympathized with the dictum of Sir William Hamilton: "In the universe there is nothing great but man; in man there is nothing great but mind."

Idealization, however, to be of any value, requires the possession of right standards of judgment. The poet, therefore, must be able to see things in large relations, discern the universal in the particular, catch glimpses of the absolute truth and beauty in its minor manifestations. The greatest poetry is impossible except to a great philosopher. I know what prejudices I am encountering here,— still I believe that these prejudices originate in a mistaken and narrow view of what poetry is. If poetry is the imaginative reproduction of the universe in its ideal relations, then nothing human, nothing divine, can be foreign to the poet. He must know psychology, and ethics, and politics, and law; he must know the physical sciences, and he must be a theologian as well. Of course I do not mean that he must be a master in details; but this is certain, that the great poets have possessed themselves of the substance of the knowledge of their times. And this means that the great poet must be a man of broad mind, of deep sympathy — a great thinker and a great man.

There are three things in particular which serve as standards in all idealization, and which the great poet must rightly apprehend. He must, first of all, have a right view of human nature. He must believe in freedom and immortality. "No great poet was ever a fatalist." The poetry of mere fate

denies man's consciousness, and fails to inspire. Emerson was better than his philosophy, when he wrote :

> "So near is grandeur to our dust,
> So near is God to man,
> When duty whispers low, 'Thou must,'
> The youth replies, 'I can.' "

How different from this is the writing of George Eliot, with her exaggeration of heredity ! To her, life is but the working out of inborn tendencies. Man may struggle and he may pray, but his nature is too much for him at last. Those who have seen Elihu Vedder's illustrations of Omar Khayyam will remember the ever-recurring swirl that images human life ; the many threads that come, no man knows whence,— that go, no man knows whither ; the gathering of these threads for a moment into the knot of human consciousness, and then the scattering of that consciousness forever. No wonder that at that centre stands the wine-cup. It is the old philosophy of the brute : "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Now, I say that with such a conception as this there can be no proper idealization, and no poetry that will permanently touch the heart of man. Life is not worth writing poetry about, for it has lost its dignity. The true poet believes less in environment, and more in will ; less in heredity, and more in freedom. Charles Kingsley has said that the spirit of the ancient tragedy was "man conquered by circumstance," while the spirit of the modern tragedy is "man conquering circumstance." But this is only partly true. Even the ancient tragedy had its Prometheus, with unconquerable will asserting his freedom, in spite of the thunderbolts and the vultures. And there is still more to be said. The thirst of conscience for reparation is the very essence of tragedy, whether ancient or modern. And this conscience witnesses to freedom in the past, and to an immortality of retribution in the future. Poetry must take account of these facts in the nature of man, or it ceases to be poetry. Now, we claim for Robert Browning that he recognizes them. In his pages we read of human freedom. *Ixion* is a poem worthy, for its spirit and its power, to be put side by side with the *Prometheus* of Æschylus. In it, the victim, bound to his iron wheel, can still triumph over Jove. In *Pippa Passes*, the innocent peasant-girl trips in simple gladness from scene to scene, singing as she goes :

> "God's in his heaven,
> All's right with the world!"

but her little song rouses conscience, makes vice seem hateful, reveals men to themselves. All unconsciously to herself, her words strike right and left —"a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death," and the result is two murders and three souls saved. I know of no poem since *Macbeth* that so portrays the agony of an awakened conscience. In this day of Hegelian revival, when moral evil and natural evil are confounded with each other, our literature needs to be invigorated by a fresh breeze from Dante, by Shakespeare's pictures of remorse, and by Robert Browning's illustrations of the terrors and retributions of man's own moral nature.

If the poet must have proper views of human nature, it is yet more important that he should have proper views of the divine. He must recognize the fact that there is a God. A poet of whom it can be said that "God

is not in all his thoughts," has missed the greatest thought of poetry,—for "the greatest thought of the finite is the Infinite." So Jean Paul has said, and Mr. Browning would adopt his phrase. Our author's writing is so full of this divine element that many a reader would fain call him a religious philosopher, if not a religious poet. We maintain that the highest poetry is impossible without religion, not only because the thought of God is the most sublime and fruitful of thoughts, but because from this loftiest thought all our lower thoughts take their proper measure and color. He who has no sense of God can never look at finite things in their right proportions. He who does not see in God an infinite personality, righteousness, and love, can never interpret the world, with its sorrow and its sin.

Browning believes in the personality and righteousness and love of God. He is at war indeed with the anthropomorphism which would degrade God to the level of human appetites and passions. His *Caliban on Setebos* is a most scathing and convincing arraignment of superstitious and slavish worship. *The Epilogue*, in which David stands as the type of the religion that confines God to place, and Renan as the type of the skepticism that gazes sensuously into heaven until the last star of faith grows dim and disappears, ends with Mr. Browning's own declaration of faith in an immanent Deity :

> "That one face, far from vanish, rather grows,
> Or decomposes but to recompose,
> Become my universe that feels and knows."

But that this is not pantheism, we are assured by other poems like *Saul*, in which, not content with an unmoral God, he declares that "all's Law, yet all's Love," and maintains that incarnation is the only true revelation. So Pompilia strikes the same note, when she says :

> "I never realized God's birth before—
> How he grew likest God in being born."

Ferishtah's Fancies, thought by some to be only a collection of slight poems, seems to me to be one of the most significant examples of the poet's irresistible tendency to the expression of religious ideas. In these slight poems I find the following subjects successively treated : 1. God works no unnecessary miracles. 2. Let us give thanks for actual blessings, though much that we desire may fail us. 3. Faith and love go together. 4. Pray on, though you see no answer to your prayers. 5. The purpose of suffering is purification. 6. The punishment of sin is dwarfing of nature. 7. Asceticism fails of its own end. 8. Love must go before knowledge. 9. Life is worth the living.—I think no one can read over this list without being convinced that here is a poet who believes in God as well as in the soul.

But there are also relations between man and God upon which the poet must have definite opinions, if he would idealize aright. I have already referred to *Saul*, by way of evidence that Browning's God is a personal God, a God of love, a God self-revealed and brought down to our human comprehension in the incarnate Christ. I wish to speak of this same poem as embodying the true idea of inspiration, and so in general, of the communications of God to man. I speak of this poem the more readily, because it is perhaps the most widely known and the most easily understood of Browning's longer productions,—the fittest of all, therefore, for a beginner

to master. The title of the poem should be "David," rather than "Saul," for the interest centres, not in Saul's hearing, but in David's song. The shepherd-boy has been brought from the sheep-fold to chase away with music the abnormal and insane depression of Saul's spirit. David sings of nature and her beauty, but Saul is not moved. He celebrates Saul's own heroic deeds, but there is no response. David rises in spirit, as he sings; in love, he takes to himself Saul's sorrow; and, as he does so, a Spirit greater than his own takes possession of the singer; through his own love for his monarch, he is lifted up to understand something of the great love of God; his human sympathy becomes the vehicle of prophecy; in God himself he sees the desire to reveal himself in human form to men; he looks into the far future, and cries: "See the Christ stand!"

Is there any other poem than this that more fully and truly expresses the method of divine inspiration? Here is a using of human faculties and powers, of human heart and tongue, yet an elevation of all these to heights of understanding and expression which unaided humanity is powerless to reach. The supernatural uses the natural as its basis and starting-point, as its medium and vehicle; but it transcends the natural, opening to it the far reaches of prophetic vision, and attuning it to the melody of a heavenly song. I might speak of *A Death in the Desert*—an attempt to depict the last hours of St. John, and to illustrate how human nature, fainting and failing as it is, can hospitably receive and faithfully express the mind and will of the Spirit of God. But I find nowhere in Browning's writings any intimation that the gift of inspiration proper is to be confounded with the enlightenment of Christian men in general. He stops with the faith that "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." And yet the obscure and the weak may be God's workmen still:

> "All service ranks the same with God—
> With God, whose puppets best and worst
> Are we: there is no last nor first."

Alfred Tennyson has been called the religious poet of this century, apparently upon the ground of such poems as *The Two Voices*, *The Vision of Sin*, and *In Memoriam*. I dislike to shock the sensibilities of Tennyson's admirers; but I wish to record my belief that there is far more of a healthy religious spirit in Browning, than in Tennyson. In the latter, underneath the faith, there is a generally hidden, but sometimes outcropping, skepticism; so that I should hesitate to say whether his poetry had been quoted the more by the prophets of faith or the prophets of unbelief. This cannot be said of Browning. I do not read fragments of his writings in sermons preached for the purpose of criticising or denouncing the old faith. I do find him referred to in reverent discussions of the law and the attributes of God. I am inclined to commend the reading of Robert Browning to all preachers and theologians, as well as to all thoughtful Christian people. He is the most learned, stirring, impressive, literary teacher of our time; but he is a religious philosopher as well. He has expressed himself upon a larger variety of problems, than any modern poet. He who would serve men's highest interests, as secular or religious teacher, will find more of suggestion, more of illustration, more of stimulus, in Browning, than in any modern writer. To quote again from Walter Savage Landor: "His is the surest

foot, since Chaucer's, that has waked the echoes from the difficult places of poetry and of life."

I cannot leave this general subject of Browning's idealizing faculty, without fairly considering two objections to my doctrine, one directed against the seriousness, and the other against the healthfulness, of his poetry. I grant that there is at times an apparent levity. This may sometimes be merely a sign that he is consciously master of his theme — so fully master that he can play with it. The cat plays with the mouse she has caught,— she does not care to play with the dog. But Browning himself has suggested a deeper and more constant reason than this. He has appropriated as motto for *Ferishtah's Fancies* what Collier, in his edition of Shakespeare, says of that great master: "His genius was jocular, but when disposed he could be very serious." So we may say that it is the nature of Browning's genius to be jocular.

Is jocularity incompatible with seriousness? "I am never merry when I hear sweet music," says Jessica in the *Merchant of Venice*. Why did Jesus never jest? Would he have seemed to us possessed of a larger and truer humanity, if the humorous element had appeared in him? It is common to say that our Lord's unique work of suffering and death involved unique and soul-crushing burdens,— for him to laugh would have been as incongruous as for us to laugh at a funeral. We sing: "He wept that we might weep." Is it not equally true to say: "He wept that we might smile?" Since "believing, we rejoice to see the curse removed," may we not maintain that an unhindered development of all parts of our nature is first rendered possible by his death? I think no one can doubt that there is a provision in our nature for wit and jollity. Great men, with great cares, have solaced themselves with jests. We do not think either Socrates or Abraham Lincoln the less serious, because they were occasionally jocular. I will not venture to say that Browning is never guilty of seeming irreverence; but that this seeming irreverence has a really profane intent, would be hard to prove. In general, I think it is rather the bubbling up of a deep effervescent spring. It is part of his idealizing faculty to see things in their humorous relations. His jocularity, though sometimes carried to an extreme, is part of the large-mindedness of the man.

And this opens the way to the discussion of the last objection. Is Robert Browning's poetry healthful in its influence? We must grant that there is a certain freedom about its treatment of man's physical instincts, which now and then may offend critics of the Tennysonian school. There is no asceticism in Browning. He does not attempt to do without the body, as Shelley did. But neither does he deify the body, as Swinburne does. *Mens sana in corpore sano*, is his motto. He believes in food and drink — but in food and drink mainly as means, not as ends. If he ever speaks of sensuous things with something of Elizabethan frankness, we must remember that there is a mock-modesty more akin to vice than is mere freedom in speech. I find in Browning true sentiment, without a tinge of sentimentality.

John Stuart Mill once defined sentimentality as "a setting of the sympathetic aspect of things above their æsthetic aspect, or above the moral aspect of them — their right or wrong." This was the fault of the early novels, like Richardson's *Clarissa*, which drew such oceans of tears from our great-

great-grandmothers, but whose sickly and maudlin sentiment we only make merry over to-day. Now, I think it a great tribute to the healthfulness of Robert Browning's poetry, and so to his power of true idealization, when I say that, as for this mawkish sentimentality, he will have none of it. Wordsworth would have come nearer to being one of the greatest poets if he had not lacked one of his senses,— not one of the five senses, but that sixth, most important sense — the sense of the ludicrous. Browning's sense of the ludicrous stands him in good stead. He cannot be commonplace, he cannot be nonsensical, he cannot be affected, he cannot be sentimental. Our young people will get good from reading such poems as *Dis Aliter Visum*, because Browning does not believe that true love is an unreasoning impulse, but rather regards it as subject to judgment and conscience.

Passion is not its own justification ; the sympathies are under law to reason ; feeling should have a basis in fact,— these are truths which greatly need to be taught to our easy-going, pleasure-loving time, and no one has taught them so well as Browning. Out of his books there blows a healthy breeze, as from the woods and the hills, to brace up and reinvigorate a literature that was fast becoming finical and *dilettante*. And I think I am not mistaken in saying that much of the modern progress toward direct and sensible speech, both in the pulpit and in the press ; much of the new simplicity and vigor which differences our talk from the bookish conversations of Walter Scott's novels ; ay, much of the condensation and energy of recent English poetry, as compared with the long-winded wearisomeness of Wordsworth, is to be attributed to the healthful influence of Robert Browning.

Browning is greatest as a creative genius ; less great as an idealizer ; least great as a literary artist. We have said that poetry is an imaginative reproduction of the universe in its ideal relations and an expression of these relations in rhythmical literary form. It is this standard of artistic form by which we have still to try our poet. Artistic form is of two sorts, or rather, involves two elements : first, an element of construction ; and secondly, an element of rhythmical and musical expression. In considering the constructive element, we must remember that true poetry, like true science, puts before us, not merely facts, but facts in their relations. In a great poem we want, not the materials of poetry, but an organic structure ; not bricks, but a house. It is a serious question whether that can be a great poem which compels the reader to do the poet's work. I do not attempt just here to decide the question ; I only suggest it, with the view of adducing an argument or two upon each, and then leaving the reader to judge for himself. For all ordinary purposes, and in all ordinary kinds of writing, the world has come to accept Herbert Spencer's principle of style — a contribution to human knowledge, by the way, of more value and longer to be remembered than all the rest of his philosophy — I mean the principle of "economy of the reader's or hearer's attention." Given in the auditor, for example, a certain amount of intellectual and emotional energy, then the less of this energy expended in grappling with the mere form of an address, the more there will be left to seize upon the substance. Hence the wisdom of making the drapery as thin as possible, that the real form may be the better seen. Avoid all involution and remote allusion that will hinder the hearer from getting at the sense. Let the phrase of your essay

be so simple that he who runs may read. So order your material that it unfolds most easily and naturally, each new sentence adding some point of interest, and all tending to a climax of thought and of expression. This is the art of putting things. The French excel in it. Every great teacher is in this respect a literary artist. He knows how to organize his matter so as to produce the most rapid, comprehensive, and powerful impression. And this is the first thing pointed out in Milton's description of true poetry : "Simple, sensuous, passionate."

Now it is agreed by all that Browning is often obscure, and that this obscurity resides, not alone in the single phrase or verse, but also in the whole arrangement of his material. The reader often begins, as I myself began, with unprepossessed and even favorable mind, only to find that unexplained allusions throng upon him ; clews are presented which, being tracked out, seem to lead nowhither ; in fact, a labyrinth seems to be the only comparison that fits the poem. Sage doubts suggest themselves either of the poet's sanity or of our own. Or, is he trifling with us ? The average reader concludes at any rate that what is not worth Mr. Browning's while to make intelligible, it is not worth his own while to read. The very multiplicity of questions that suggest themselves at every turn, and that make so lively the meetings of the Browning clubs, are an offense to the man who does not love to think much, as he reads. I know of no author, ancient or modern, the mention of whose name just now excites more violent dispute. Certain it is that Browning divides the world. There are two hostile camps. If he is not of all poets the best loved by his friends, he is surely the best hated by his foes. Indeed, it is almost amusing to hear one who has been cheered, in beginning *Sordello*, by the author's assurance : "Who will, may hear Sordello's story told," and then has floundered through what he cannot but regard as a mediæval literary morass — I say, it is amusing to hear such a one describe the indignation with which, at the close of the poem, he read the words : "Who would, has *heard* Sordello's story told."

It is only fair, however, to listen to Browning's defense. His method, he would say, is the true method, because it is the method of life. Suppose you go down the street to-morrow morning, and as you go, perceive in the distance a great crowd stretching from curb to curb. There are excitement, and hurried ejaculations, and much rushing to and fro. You draw near, and ask some person upon the periphery of the circle what it is all about. He gives you the curt and fragmentary answer, "Murder !" and then turns from you. You press your way inward, questioning others as you can, until gradually there rises in your mind the structure of a story ; hints, which at first you could not understand, begin to be interpreted ; you modify first impressions by subsequent information ; by the time you have reached the centre of the crowd a whole tragedy of love, and jealousy, and crime, and death, has been enacted in your brain. Compare this way of getting at the story with the other way of reading about it all, in the evening paper of that same day. Which of these ways most rouses your thinking powers, most excites your interest and sympathy ? Can any one doubt that it is the former ? Now this is Browning's method,—he thrusts us into the turmoil of life, and compels us to construct the story for ourselves, He gives us facts, but only in a fragmentary way. What is said becomes fully

intelligible only in the light of further knowledge. What is the result? Why this: You become a judicial personage, and weigh evidence as the case unfolds before you. You become yourself a poet, a creator; and, when you have done, you feel that the poem is a thing of life, that you have your own hard-earned conception of it, that it is your poem as well as Mr. Browning's.

All this is best illustrated in the case of *The Ring and the Book*. As those twenty-two thousand lines pass before your eyes, your first impulse is to give up the investigation,— the case is too complicated, and life is short. But keep on, and the story gets a hold upon you; the characters become instinct with life; each new aspect of the case is like a new revelation; the whole poem becomes a mighty living structure, wheel within wheel — the fit type and representative of the life of humanity, moved upon from above by angelic influences and seized from beneath by the powers of hell. When you have read it you can call it, "A ring without a posy, and that, *mine*." In this very sense of possession, which Browning's poems awaken, I see the secret of the intense interest he excites in those who have the patience and the grace to read him. If we have to eat our bread in the sweat of our brow, Browning would say that this is precisely what he has been aiming at,— without exercise we should have no appetite, no enjoyment of our food, no profit from the eating of it.

I confess that this view of the case has much to say for itself. Certainly the best poetry is not that which yields its full meaning at the first cursory reading. If absolute intelligibility to a half-roused mind be the test of poetry, much of what we call the best is no poetry at all. No; a man cannot understand the best poetry without being something of a poet; even as he cannot appreciate Mount Blanc without looking at it from some neighboring height. The best poetry of Shakespeare, or even of Tennyson, is not mastered except by repeated readings; it takes years, and maturity indeed, before the full glory of some great passages dawns upon us. Browning compels us to work for our intellectual living, more perhaps than any other modern poet; but there is always the comfort of knowing that there is a real bag of gold at the end of this rainbow, and that there is a definite place where the rainbow ends. I do not think that Browning is obscure for the mere sake of obscurity; what obscurity there is, is a part of his art, whether the principle upon which it rests is ill-judged or not. And, with practice, the obscure becomes plain. In fact, I find that the objection upon the score of obscurity is urged less and less as the reader becomes more and more familiar with Browning's method. He expects it, he sees the object of it, he is stimulated by it, he ends by becoming a qualified admirer of it, just as he admires the twilight and the growing splendor of the stars.

Thus I have presented with all fairness the considerations *pro* and *con*, so far as respects the constructive element in Browning's poetry. I wish I could sum up and give the verdict squarely upon the side of the poet. This I fear I cannot do. I could do so, if I did not recognize certain "unexplored remainders" in his writings, the meaning of which I have some doubt whether even Browning himself ever knew. In *Ferishtah's Fancies* there are certain lines printed in the original Hebrew; this looks to me mischievous, if not malicious. A noted Greek professor said that he could understand Browning's translation of *Agamemnon* if he were only per-

mitted to use the original as a "pony." I have always thought it doubtful whether the Romans understood their own great poets at first reading. I have some sympathy with the man who declared that if the Latins had had to learn their own language, they would have had no time to conquer the world. But there is seldom what you may call willful and needless obscurity in the classic poets. Their condensed and nervous speech was meant to pack things in for preservation; and it is no wonder that the original package sometimes takes time to untie. So Browning means to pack his thought. Mrs. Orr tells us that it was a reproachful note of Miss Caroline Fox, that determined him nevermore to use an unnecessary word. Would that he had added the determination perfectly to organize his material before he began to write! While I see in Browning an untold wealth of resource, a mind most eager for expression, a power to recognize truth in its secret hiding-places, I see also an occasional lack of judgment as to what is valuable and what is merely curious, and a lack of constructive power to make the most of the matter that is chosen. He seems at times content with first drafts; willing to put down out of a teeming mind what first comes to hand; and ready to say, upon objection made, that, if the reader cannot understand it, so much the worse for the reader. Here he is something less than a great literary artist; for true art is intelligible, and no unintelligible poem can ever become immortal.

I cannot leave this part of my subject without putting something of the poet's least intelligible verse side by side with something of his simplest and best. I know few passages more difficult as to form, yet more noble for depth and insight, than this one from *The Ring and the Book:* (1: 225 *sq.*)

> "God breathes, not speaks, his verdicts, felt not heard—
> Passed on successively to each court, I call
> Man's conscience, custom, manners, all that make
> More and more effort to promulgate, mark
> God's verdict in determinable words,
> Till last come human jurists — solidify
> Fluid result,— what's fixable lies forged,
> Statute,— the residue escapes in fume,
> Yet hangs aloft a cloud, as palpable
> To the finer sense as word the legist welds.
> Justinian's Pandects only make precise
> What simply sparkled in men's eyes before,
> Twitched in their brow or quivered on their lip,
> Waited the speech they called but would not come."

Yet this passage is obscure to many, merely because the thought is profound. To such let us commend *The Martyr's Epitaph*, in which Browning shows himself capable of a simplicity and grandeur unsurpassed in English poetry:

> "Sickly I was, and poor, and mean—
> A slave; no misery could screen
> The holders of the pearl of price
> From Cæsar's envy; therefore twice
> I fought with beasts, and thrice I saw
> My children suffer by his law.
> At length my own release I earned;
> I was some time in being burned,
> But at the last a hand came through
> The flame above my head and drew
> My soul to Christ, whom now I see.
> Sergius, a brother, wrote for me
> This testimony on the wall;
> For me — I have forgot it all."

The truest artistic form requires something more than the constructive element; it implies also the element of rhythmical and musical expression. The good and true must be married to the beautiful. This marriage certainly seems made in heaven, for nothing more surprises the poet than the leaping, from his brain, of thought and word together — wedded from their birth. In this matter of melodious expression, the poets differ more than in almost anything else. We modern and English-speaking people owe, in this respect, a great debt to Shelley. I find in him a "linked sweetness long drawn out," that Milton himself was never master of, and that Swinburne has sought, but with weaker intellectual powers, to copy. It is a wonder that, with Browning's passionate admiration of Shelley, he has in his own writing so little of Shelley's distinguishing excellence. In this mastery of melodious expression, Mrs. Elizabeth Barrett Browning is greatly the superior of her husband. Compare *Lady Geraldine's Courtship* with the *Flight of the Duchess;* compare *My Kate* with *The Lady of Tripoli;* and you cannot help seeing that the wife puts into her verse a delicate sweetness and a tremulous emotion which the husband can never equal.

Indeed, for a reason already suggested when I spoke of defects of construction, Robert Browning aims *not* to be an emotional poet. And here let us do him justice, as we can only do by looking at the matter from his peculiar point of view. Browning found the literary world well-nigh enslaved to a poetry in which sense was sacrificed to sound, in which melody of phrase took the place of thought, in which mere sweetness covered a multitude of sins of vagueness and rhapsody and inanity. You could read such poetry when half asleep, and you were quite asleep when you were done. Browning thought such writing beneath the dignity of the poet. No "Airy, fairy Lilians" would he write. His poetry should carry no one to heaven on flowery beds of ease. Men's minds should be alert, if they read him at all. Hence his brusque air, his harsh turns, his scorn for the merely sensuous and quieting, his startling us from dreams into sense. A little poem of his illustrates this:

> "Verse-making was least of my virtues: I viewed with despair
> Wealth that never yet was, but might be,— all that verse-making were,
> If the life would but lengthen to wish, let the mind be laid bare.
> So I said 'To do little is bad, to do nothing is worse'—
> And made verse.
>
> Love-making — how simple a matter! No depths to explore,
> No heights in a life to ascend! No disheartening Before,
> No affrighting Hereafter,— love now will be love evermore.
> So I felt, 'To keep silence were folly — all language above,'
> I made love."

It reminds me of an out-of-door play of my early days which bore the name of "Snap the Whip." A long line was formed of boys taking hold of hands, the biggest and strongest boy at one end of the line, the smallest and most unsuspecting at the other, many fine gradations between. The game was to swing the line around, with the big boy for the centre, and to swing it around with such momentum that the little boy at the small end should be thrown off like a comet from the solar system. It was fine fun for the big boy; for the little one it meant the general demoralization of

his attire and the breaking of his head against the fence. Many a time, as I have read Robert Browning and have been hurled off into vacancy by one of his sudden turns, I have felt like the little boy in "Snap the Whip." It is all very well for Mr. Browning, but how about the unsophisticated reader? Is it possible for him to escape a certain sense of injury?

Emotion, music, grace — these are not so native to Robert Browning as thought. The philosopher often overtops the poet. His harshness is not all to be pardoned upon the plea that it is a higher kind of art. Much of it is to be accounted for only upon the ground that "it is his nature to." Verse is not quite spontaneous with him. John Stuart Mill's conception of God is somewhat similar. The imperfections of the universe, he thinks, argue either lack of love or lack of power in the supreme Intelligence; he prefers to doubt the power, rather than to doubt the love; God does the best he can, but he has to work with very intractable material. And so Mill speaks of God as if he were some weak old man trudging up-hill with a mighty burden which he cannot easily manage, which, in fact, he is just able to carry — a shocking representation of Him whom we know to be infinite in power as well as infinite in love. I have sometimes thought that the representation was an excellent one of merely earthly creators, and of none more so than of Mr. Browning. His material at times seems too much for him. The metal is not hot enough to run freely into poetic moulds; the metal is of the best, but the power to shape it into perfect forms — the highest measure of this is lacking.

In Italy they have a peculiar way of cooking and serving that pretty little bird, the ortolan. It is transfixed with a skewer, but upon the skewer are also put a piece of brown toast upon the one side, a sage-leaf upon the other. So come, in thick succession, sage-leaf, ortolan, toast, sage-leaf, ortolan, toast, repeated as many times as need be. Browning likens his writing, very justly, to the combination of these three. The ortolan represents the poetry; the sage-leaf furnishes piquancy; the brown toast is nothing but sound sense. I admire his candor, — few poets are so frank. My only fear is that at times when ortolans were scarce and thin, Mr. Browning may have made up for their lack by putting two sage-leaves in place of one, and by indefinitely increasing the size and thickness of the brown toast. I would not indulge myself, however, nor would I advise my younger readers to indulge, in the calm superciliousness with which many intelligent people still treat Robert Browning. It is not wise to assume that so steadily growing a fame and so marked an influence upon current literature are without any just foundation. It is best to take account of the forces of our time; we cannot afford to be ignorant of them. The youth who postponed his crossing of the stream until the water should flow by had to wait for a long time. So, it seems to me, the man who regards what he calls the "Browning-cult" as a mere temporary craze, "*exspectat, dum defluit amnis.*" Those who know most of Browning are rather inclined to say of him as Isocrates said of Heracleitus: "What I know of him is so excellent that I can draw conclusions from it concerning what I cannot understand."

And one can say all this without for a moment surrendering his powers of critical judgment. He only insists that wisdom does not exclude wonder,

and that we live, as intellectual and spiritual beings, only by "admiration, hope, and love." The *nil admirari* spirit is the spirit of decrepitude and death, and faith in great men is next to faith in God. I would not have Robert Browning's defects of artistic form blind any of my readers to the broad humanity of the poet and his ideal pictures of the deep thoughts of man's heart. No poet of this century is so widely learned, no poet has so pondered the great problems of existence, no poet has uttered so much of important truth. There is, of course, a higher poetry than his, a poetry of wider range, of sweeter sound, of deeper spiritual significance. As civilization goes on, imagination will not fall into disuse, but will reach a higher development. To believe otherwise is to fancy that an inalienable prerogative of the human soul can be sloughed off as a mere excrescence, or can dwindle till it ceases to be. No, imagination belongs to man; and, as with advancing ages man's range of vision widens, imagination will only be furnished with larger and nobler materials; will only have deeper insight into the ideal relations of the universe; will only grow in power to express the truth. With larger truth will come deeper emotions, and with deeper emotions will come greater perfection of artistic form. If there were only as much of us at all times as there is at some times, and if power of expression only answered always to the heart's desire, living would be a delight and earth would be heaven. I take the very sense of imperfection in all poetry of the past as an incentive to look forward. I not only anticipate no decline of poetry, but I confidently predict a day when, under the influence of a diviner spirit than any earthly muse, poetry shall be the chief handmaid of religion, the incarnate God shall be its chief subject, and the poet shall undertake "things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme." I look for a grander poetry on earth,—but I am not content with this. I want all God's sons and daughters to prophesy; I trust we shall all be poets in the New Jerusalem; I long for the great future, when the soul can fully express herself, when form shall answer to spirit, when language shall be the perfect vehicle of thought, and when all speech shall be song.

L.

ADDRESSES TO SUCCESSIVE GRADUATING CLASSES

OF THE ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

1873:

"THE THREE ONLIES."

Dear Brethren :— It is my pleasant duty to declare your preliminary work in the Rochester Theological Seminary as at length completed, to congratulate you upon the good measure of success with which that work has been performed, and to commend you to the guidance and blessing of the great Head of the Church in that larger work to which you go and which I trust he has called you to do.

There is an element of sadness in this occasion. We shall see your faces, and you will see each other's faces, no more for many a year — perhaps never again until we all come to lay the fruits of our labors at the Master's feet. Yet the dominant feeling in your hearts as well as in ours to-night is one of rejoicing,— in yours, because you break through the last obstacle that holds you back from the wider life and broader influence to which you have been so long aspiring,— in ours, because your going out from us gives us new faith that Christ is making the Institution from which you graduate a power for the building up of his kingdom in the world.

Not because you are so many or because you add so greatly to the *number* of his ministers do we rejoice, but rather because we trust that under God you will improve the *quality* of ministerial work in the land and the world. In one sense there are ministers enough,— but of men thoroughly furnished, men who know the times, men who know the truth of God as the only and all-sufficient remedy for the evils of these times and of all times, men who have learned from God the secret of divine wisdom and power in bringing this truth to bear upon the living hearts of men, men who believe in a personal God, a present Savior, an old but everlasting gospel, and who are willing to give themselves body and soul for life and death to the preaching of it — of these, though thank God we have many, we have not enough. If you be such men, my brethren, the world is waiting and longing for your coming ; God calls you forward to your work, assuring your success and your reward ; and all the churches of our Lord cry : "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation, that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth."

The German poet said : "Respect the dreams of thy youth!" There is

a loftiness of aspiration and an enthusiasm of self-sacrifice which belong to the youth of Christ's servants. Now, if ever in life, noble voices speak within you, urging you to the highest consecration, and the most absolute and faithful following of the path marked out by God. I would be the mouthpiece of the Spirit to-night. I would stir up those familiar but central thoughts which are the inspiration and power of every successful ministry. I would commend to you anew those old and tried ideas and powers, which have proved their strength by leading the march of the kingdom until now.

There are three of them,— and the first of them is the word of God. In the personality of that word, as I may term it, speaking as with living voice to him who reads it or hears it preached, discerning as it does the thoughts and intents of the heart, bringing the soul into contact with the living God, we have the sufficient proof of its divinity and inspiration. This Institution has sought to ground you in that word, as the norm of faith, the source of comfort, the guide of life. Preach that word, my brethren, in its due proportion, in its relations to the times, in its sole and supreme authority. Remember that, if human opinion speak not according to that word, it is because there is no light in it. Remember that by that word we must be approved or condemned at the last day. Not novelties, not paradoxes, not sensations, not tricks of eloquence, not progressive views, but the old word of God that is able to make us wise unto salvation — let this be the weapon, and the only weapon, of your ministry. As you shall bring this word of God, this sword of the Spirit, to bear upon the conscience and the heart, with all its penetrating and clearing power, shall your work be judged a success or a failure.

But by this word you are to lead men to something beyond the word — to Him who speaks through the word, I mean to the living Christ. Not impersonal truth, viewless and impalpable, a breath that enters the ear and leaves it as soon, but a living personal Redeemer, who makes God known and brings the soul into relations of amity and communion with him — this is the unspeakable gift of God — this is the hope of the ministry. Not faith in an abstract God, but in a living, present Savior — one whose work outside of us has reconciled God to us, one whose work within us has reconciled us to God — this is the faith of the gospel. The hope of the Church and the world is a living Christ — not a Christ stretched upon the crucifix, not a dead Christ entombed and buried, but a risen and glorified Savior, exalted to give repentance and remission of sins. — No success, till you bring men to this faith in a living Jesus and to personal dealings of Jesus with their souls,— actual communication of life to life — heart beating against heart,— intercourse and communion with One whose presence and being are more real to us than the existence of the world around us. The personal knowledge of this Christ — introduction to him, life in him — this is the end and aim of the Christian ministry.

How can this be realized? Partly by the spirit of our own lives. Do you not remember how some unlettered man has thrilled you, and drawn you to Christ, by his simple words of love to Jesus? Do you not know how a true Christian man makes all men who meet him feel the indefinable attraction of his goodness and self-sacrifice? Believe that the presence of Christ in you will give you, even though your natural powers may not be the greatest,

an attraction to all believers, and an influence to draw all men to God. The power of a life lived by faith in the Son of God — why, it is irresistible! He must succeed who sides with God. But not simply because his own spirit is a power. No! there is a divine Spirit that makes man's weakness strength, that teaches man to labor and to pray, and that supplements his efforts with divine efficiency.

They are Luther's "three onlies"— these powers of the Christian ministry — the word of God only, faith in Christ only, the power of the Spirit only. Trust these, my brethren. In the strength of these, go forth to meet this living age, and the living God shall go with you. There is no work so noble on earth to do — none that so developes mind and heart. Whether outward success may be yours or not, is little matter. God will make your work the means of developing in you the highest manhood, and your labor shall not be in vain in the Lord. As you come back in future years to this scene of your early studies and vows, we shall greet you as soldiers who bring good news from the fight,— we shall send you out again, as we do now, laden with our prayers that God will give you a multitude of trophies in the great conflict. But whether the reward shall come on earth or not, be willing all the same to labor, with God and the angels for your witnesses, and the Judgment for the testing-day and day of triumph. But I must not detain you. The time of preparation is past. Your work calls you. Go forth to meet it. Quit you like men, and may the grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion and participation of the Holy Ghost, be with you both now and evermore, Amen.

1874:

TRUTH AND LOVE.

Brethren of the Graduating Class: — This hour is one of the serious hours of life. To you, because it marks the completion of your preparatory work, and the opening of the great doors that hitherto have shut you out from the business of life. To me serious, because it marks the close of my first course of instruction, the end of the first imperfect round of theological investigation. You are my first children, and first children have a peculiar place in the parent's heart which none have after. I may be confidential with you now, and tell you how I prayed when I first half tremblingly undertook my work, that God would give me for my first pupils a considerate class — a class by whose side and upon whose level I could put myself, for honest and patient and earnest study of God's great system of truth. I wish to thank you publicly for the kindness and candor with which you have received my teaching. No captious or ungentle word has ever been spoken even in the greatest stress and fervor of our disputings together. And in all our personal relations there has been the warmth of a Christian affection, which to this hour I believe has not ceased or even diminished, but has steadily increased even to the end. It has been my joy and crown to see that converse with the truth was stiffening the fibre and widening the reach of your minds, and that with intellectual progress there was also religious growth.

But we have come to the end at last. Such as it is, and whatever it is, my mark upon you has been made. You go out to be the first representatives of my training and influence. Do you wonder that I hesitate to say the word that parts us,— that I would fain hold you still, to better my work,— that it is with great sadness, even with my great hopes for your future, that I hasten on to the blessing and the farewell?

This occasion will never come again, and none resembling it. There is more of personality in it, than ever can be again. And though this address is, in its original design, an expression of others' good wishes than my own, you will allow me to make it to-night the vehicle of my own thought with regard to you, and so a summing up of what I have desired the general influence of Seminary instruction to be. I can only indicate the two main features of it. First, to form the fixed habit of earnest pondering and independent judgment with regard to the truth, as to doctrine and duty. That implies a fundamental conviction that there is such a thing as truth in spiritual things, reality corresponding to normally conducted thinking. It implies a burning desire, an unalterable determination, to know the most of this truth that the strength and range of our understandings will admit. It implies the instinct of progress — putting shame on any idolizing of past attainments, and making willingness to accept new light, from every quarter under heaven, the very watchword of all investigation. No contemptuous sneering at opponents, no dogmatizing as if wisdom would die with us, but fair-mindedness in recognizing objection and allowing it all proper weight, while at the same time we put it in its place of subordination, if that be its due. It implies holding to the truth, standing by the truth, living for the truth, and living out the truth when we have found it,— our progress ruled by the facts of revelation, marked not by disregard of them but by greater reverence for them,— no arbitrary and irrational progress, but a progress according to law — the double law of nature and of Scripture. I believe, my brethren, that we have together dug down to some great rocky facts of being, and have to some extent built alike upon these. But if you go out to complete your structure of Christian doctrine, brick for brick like that which you have seen us build, you are no true disciples of ours. Remember that we have taught you that the word of God is infinitely higher than all human teachers,— and that, if you are to be living men influencing your age for God, you must "prove all things — holding fast only that which is good."

Secondly, we have desired that the discipline of this Seminary should form in you the habit of seeking the truth, holding the truth, speaking the truth, living the truth, in love. Our theological institutions have often been charged with making men critical at the expense of the emotional life; intellectual at the expense of practical power; learned at the expense of piety. I trust you have proved the contrary in your own experience. I know that clearer views of truth have opened new fountains of emotion within you, given you new weapons for practical work, drawn you into closer sympathy and communion with Christ. Let me remind you that the aim of all our instruction has been to show that truth and love are not only consistent with each other, but that truth without love is not truth,— that only love can find the truth, or utter the truth, or hold the truth, or live the truth. I repeat to

you now, what I have said in a hundred forms before, that only as you are men given to Christ in a self-sacrificing love that reflects the love of Gethsemane and Calvary, can you ever know the inner secrets of God's word, or have power to win a single soul from darkness to light. Will you ever forget that no true preaching and no true living for God is possible without having Christ himself, the living love of God within? — without knowing by personal and blessed experience that union with Christ which is the central fact of all theology and of all religion? — without being possessed by a higher, larger, more enduring energy than that of a weak, unstable, human will — even the energy of Christ's loving, indwelling Spirit? Forget all else, my brethren, but forget not this. By it, your life and your ministry stand or fall. You can do all things through Christ who strengthens you, but without him you can do nothing.

I trust these two great principles of all noble living — truth-seeking and Christ-loving — have taken such possession of you here, that entrance upon more direct and active labors for men's salvation will be no shock to you, but only the joyful widening of your sphere. Our hearts go forward with you into the future before you. Your future is our future, your labors our labors, your trials our trials, your success our success. I cannot tell you of the eagerness with which we shall listen for tidings of you, nor of the joy with which we shall hear that you are growing in power to unfold God's truth, that you are learning new spiritual lessons of communion with Christ, that you are developing new tenderness and patience and self-sacrifice in your care for the flock of God, and in your toilful efforts to bring erring and perverted souls into the fold. Work and pray for Christ and his Church; take the place he puts you in; think not of reward; lose your lives for God's sake; and the reward will be sure enough, and great enough. Having been "faithful over a few things" on earth, Christ will make you "rulers over many things" when he comes in the Judgment. Go, then, and God be with you! Farewell.

1875:

MANHOOD IN THE MINISTRY.

Brethren of the Graduating Class: — All earthly things come to an end, and we have reached the end of our work together. It is not simply custom which bids me address to you this parting word. You have been faithful students, and we believe you to be good and true men. Three years of mental contact and of harmonious intercourse cannot be terminated without regrets, and these regrets I express not only for myself but for the whole faculty, including that instructor whose ill health and absence is so great a source of grief both to himself and to us. It is little we can now do for you. I trust our best lessons have been already learned too well for time's effacing fingers ever to blot them from your memories. Yet one word more — this it is — be true men in order that you may be true ministers of Christ, — regard the culture and maintenance of your own manhood as a prime condition of successful service.

There is a sense in which I would not have you follow this exhortation. It is possible to seek self first and Christ last — to identify Christ with true manhood rather than true manhood with Christ. It makes all the difference in the world whether we make Christ or man the centre of our system — whether we take the law of Scripture, or become a law to ourselves. Our nature is perverted; we cannot wholly trust its impulses. Only in Christ do we find the true humanity — the archetype and standard and source of true manhood for us. It is not then a self-centered development, with the distant aim of honoring Christ, to which I exhort you. What I do urge upon you is a development of Christian manhood, after Christ's model and by the help of his Spirit, as prior both in order and importance to the mere official work and outward service which you have been called to do.

True manhood in the ministry,— the very notion is a negation of several ignoble conceptions of ministerial life and character. You are not hired caterers to popular amusement, or special policemen to ferret out public or private delinquencies; you are not expounders of an abstract system or creed, or creatures of a different mould and order from your fellows to deal out salvation to them by any external appliances or ordinances. You are to be men among men, meeting men on their own level, aiming directly at their understanding and sympathy, and therefore putting away as one of Satan's devices every peculiarity of dress or tone which savors of mere professionalism and which turns men's thoughts to the minister rather than to the man.

The more obvious elements of true manliness, such as moral thoughtfulness, decision of character, and resolute courage, I do not need to mention to you. I wish to emphasize two or three of the less commonly noticed characteristics of true manhood,— and one is *openness*. Openness of mind and heart; openness to receive — openness to give. It has been called a chief element of greatness, and if greatness is a growth, it must be so; for, only where there is the openness of true sympathy, the entering into the mind and life of others, the readiness to take in good of every sort, can there be real growth of mind or heart. The narrow prejudice and egotism that shut men up in their own dignity and opinion bar out the very material of which greatness is made, and they equally bar out that which is greater than greatness, namely, this true manhood of which I speak. Openness to give also — the openness that gathers in all treasures of nature and art, literature and life, only to melt them in the fires of Christian love and send them forth new-stamped, with Christ's image and superscription marked upon each coin, so that every fact of the world becomes a witness to God and his salvation — this openness of receiving and giving is necessary to make us men. You have a mind and heart and will of your own. God has renewed these powers of yours, and has given you experience of his grace. Now let what is in you come out. Away with that shamefacedness and timidity and suspiciousness that are born of unbelief and vanity and supreme care for self. Cast yourselves upon God, and then tell out your very souls to men. You will not only be true men yourselves, but you will make true men of others; for it is the law of progress of God's kingdom that mind should answer to mind and heart to heart, and that the openness of true manhood should be self-communicating.

I have another element to add which is hard to name, but which seems to me specially important,—let me call it *spontaneity of movement.* I mean by it a self-determined activity of all the powers. That is a true notion of our relation to God's Spirit which holds that we are to be possessed by God and used by God just as *really* as if we were inert instruments or machines, but that is a very false notion of the relation which holds that therefore we *are* nothing more than inert instruments or machines. Would that we could utterly rid ourselves of the notion that God's working in the human soul makes us any the less truly men, or supersedes in any degree our own activity. Christianity is not passivity,—it is new life and energy and will. The preacher who idly waits for his sermon or his audience to come to him, instead of working out his sermon and gathering his audience, needs to be taught the first principles of Christ's work. There is a sense in which a man is to have no will of his own, but there is also a sense in which he is to be all will. He is to do God's will with all the power of his own will. He is to be irrepressible in his invention, his enterprise, his onset. Like water running down hill, if he is checked in one direction, he is to find his way downward in another. Men are to be reached, something is to be accomplished. The preacher is to be all things to all men, if by any means he may save some. The strongest thing in the universe that we know anything about next to God, is a living human will, and it is God's purpose that this human will shall serve him. There are quite enough ministers who fancy that their whole work for God is that of suffering God's will. The great trouble with the ministry of our time is that there are so many in its ranks who have to be supported — mere hangers-on and camp-followers, instead of soldiers and leaders in the fight. I pray you, if no place comes to you, make a place for yourselves. Strike out some new path into the moral wastes of city or country or world. Such were all the early laborers of the church of Christ. Serving an apprenticeship of this sort, beginning at the lowest round of the ladder, proving the power of the gospel upon the least promising subjects and in the least promising conditions, will make men of you, and will give you a power and influence in the future which now you cannot measure. Use your wills, then; determine upon success; hew your way toward it. Be sure that Christ your Master would have you no waifs upon the surface of the stream, but active and original powers to turn the current of the world's history into the channel of his purposes. He has sent you to make your mark upon society and the church, and to summon up resolve and determination and daring to fulfil this calling is not pride or arrogance or overweening ambition, but is that very working out of your own salvation which proves that God is working in you to will and to do.

Openness — spontaneity — these are two. But there is one more — I mean concentration. This is an age of division of labor. Specialties in study and work rule the day. No man can now be, like Michael Angelo, painter, sculptor, architect, poet, man of society, all in one. No man can make himself a lawyer without devoting himself to law — and to some department of the law. So with medicine — so with trade. And yet many a minister of Christ fancies that he can be an investigator in science, and a writer for reviews, and an amateur in art, and a popular lecturer, and still do justice to the pulpit. Dr. Chalmers thought so in his youth. It was only when

Dr. Chalmers changed his mind and gave himself body and soul to preaching, that he began to stir Scotland. Of all things essential to true manhood this is behind none, namely, unity of purpose; and of all pitiable spectacles this is one of the most pitiable — a universal *dilettante* in the ministry. To move men in masses by the power of Christ's gospel — is not this enough to stir one man's pulses with enthusiasm? The cry about decline of the pulpit means simply this, that preachers have sometimes been ashamed of their work, and have ceased to make full proof of their ministry. Preaching has not lost its power, where men put all their power into preaching. The pulpit is a very throne for the man who will spend *himself* in it. I do not disparage broad studies. I say the preacher must be open to every whisper of the world, but I do say that the pulpit must be the focus of the whispering gallery where all sounds converge. The homiletical habit must be the dominant habit of the preacher's soul. In that pleading with men on behalf of the living God, all endowments and all culture may have part, and all themes in heaven and earth may be laid under tribute for argument or corroboration; but none of these endowments and none of this learning will be worth a straw to one of you, if they be not made wholly subservient to the one purpose of making you able ministers of the New Testament and good stewards of the manifold grace of God.

Be true men, then, in order that you may be true ministers,— men of open mind and heart, men of will and spontaneous energy, men devoted to a single aim. But every review of this sort inevitably leads us back to the point from which we started. You cannot be true men — men of the stamp I have indicated — without being true ministers. The man makes the minister, but the minister also makes the man. Only as you know Christ and love Christ and obey Christ, only as you live in him and are ruled by him, can you really be any of these things. But you know all this. This has been the staple of our teaching and talk and prayer for three years past. Only in Him who is the perfect flower and embodiment of true humanity — the head and source of a new human nature answering to the divine idea — can we find again the true manhood which was lost in the fall. But there, in the risen and glorified Jesus, it is, for us and for all.

You go forth on different errands, some to teach, some to preach,— some to carry the torch of salvation out into the heathen darkness, some to keep the lights burning at home. But your work is one, and your Lord is one. Alike you aim to bring men to the comprehension and attainment of Christian manhood. You can do this, only as you yourselves grow up into the stature of perfect men in Christ Jesus, only as the minister becomes in the highest sense the man. I commend you to that perfect man who is God also, and who is able to make you like himself. I bid you depend wholly upon him. But, as my last word to you, I urge you not to satisfy yourselves with passive trust and waiting, but with open soul and vigorous resolve and unity of purpose, to "quit you like men" in this one and only life that is given you to live, and which from this moment opens before you.

1876:

WORK AND POWER.

Brethren of the Graduating Class:— With much struggle you have by God's favor pushed your way to your present stage of preparation for the gospel ministry. You have all of you in various ways commended yourselves to your instructors in this Institution, and we send you forth with the confidence that your training here will prove not to have been in vain. It tempers the sadness of our parting with you to think that you constitute our annual quota of reinforcement to the leaders of Christ's militant church.

You can well understand how hope for your future should mingle with anxiety. Life is so short, eternity is so long, that which is now has in it so much of that which is to come, that I cannot let you go without reminding you again, and with the solemnity of a last appeal, of a relation most needful to be considered in these our times,— I mean the relation between work and power. You have sharpened your tools; your work is before you; have you the power that will enable you to do it for God?

Of the two, power is the primary and more important. In a great machine-shop a hundred men may stand at their lathes, ready with their tools for work, but a slight neglect or mistake in the engine-room may cut off the steam and render their skill of no avail. He would be a sorry miller who should devote his whole attention to setting the burr-stones and buying the wheat, while he gave no care to provide a water-supply to run his wheel. The wise manufacturer will have his reserves of power for exigencies, and will make sure of the connections between that power and the looms it is to move. Nature makes no mistakes here. She stores up nervous force in the brain like electricity in a Leyden jar,— when the critical moment comes, there is hardness to the muscle and strength to the blow. The power that moves our modern world, so far as its material progress is concerned, is derived from the coal-measures which nature made ready ages ago. And now if God and man make so much of *power*, shall the Christian minister forget it, when he has a work to do compared with which the mighty achievements of secular industry and the greatest movements of the natural world are but child's play?

For all power we are dependent. We are not self-moving machines. The body must be fed,— the mind must be disciplined and furnished. No man is self-made,— no man is self-sustained. Whatever of power he uses or has, he gets from outside himself. He draws upon and employs God's power. Dependence is the condition of finite being. But what is true even in the natural realm is far more profoundly, intensely true in the realm of spirit. For all spiritual life and energy we are absolutely dependent upon God. No spiritual work done without him can prosper; but that is not the whole of it — severed from Him we can accomplish nothing. Shut the sluice-gate through which God's power flows into you,— the mill-race runs dry, the sound of the grinding is low, soon it ceases altogether. Cut off your base of supplies in God and the provision of his Spirit,— you are in the enemy's hands; you are captured or you starve. To learn this lesson that we have no strength of ourselves — this is the end of precept and warning, of chastise-

ment and humiliation. We cannot keep our own souls alive,— much less can we bring out from their graves the spiritually dead. But all is changed when God's power is given to us. Then wonders are wrought in the renewing of human hearts, fit to be compared with that marvel of the ages when the soul of God was put into the body of the dead Christ and he was raised from the tomb in life and glory.

The power exists — as real, as mighty, as accessible as the forces of nature which man bends to his purposes of art and industry. How are we to obtain and use it? Just as we obtain and use any other power — by acting according to its laws. No man really compels nature to serve him, except by obeying her. We discover her methods and apply them, and then we say that we control her. So this Niagara-power of spiritual influence in God we bind to our work, only as we discover its laws and submit ourselves to them. For here is more than nature — more than blind force, such as men conceive to move the spheres. Here is a living will, a personal and present God. We use his power only as we are used by Him. We secure his help and inspiration only as we recognize him as Supreme and Sovereign, blowing where he listeth, dividing to every man severally as he will, and in that conviction turn ourselves from agents into instruments, and deem it our highest honor to be arrows in the hand of the Almighty.

That was excellent theological instruction that Christ gave for three years to his apostles, but he did not deem them fitted for their work till they had received another and a higher gift — the gift of the Spirit. They had done work for him before, but it was like work done on a hand machine, where the energy was mostly spent in turning the crank. After Pentecost, they were power-machines,— no effort now — they could not but speak the things they had seen and heard. Enthusiasm — ἐν θεῷ — they had this, now that they were possessed by the Spirit of God. Their faces had a strange light, their voices a strange tenderness, their very gestures a strange power, to impress and move and win men to the service of their Lord. Their faith became contagious. Doubt vanished, as it heard the story of Christ. Through the work of the Spirit, the cross of shame became the power of God.

We have no right idea of the Christian ministry, unless we conceive of it as a prophetic office. No miracle-working, no revelation of new truth, but special direction and power of the Holy Spirit in the unfolding and application of the old truth of the Bible to men's present circumstances and needs — this is the New Testament prophesying to which you are called. And what shall a prophet be without the Spirit? And how shall the Spirit be obtained or retained without prayer? The apostles "gave themselves to prayer, and to the ministry of the word." Let the ministry of to-day in like manner make prayer and preaching coördinate in rank and importance; let them give to supplication for the gifts of the Spirit the first place and the best place in their time and regard,— instead of making a be-all and end-all of direct efforts to impress strong hearts with truth which the preacher cannot feel himself; in short, let the work of the ministry be only a supplement to the continuous seeking of power from on high; and Pentecost will come again, never more to cease from the earth, until every heart of man has felt Christ's power to save.

May God put it into your hearts, my brethren, to be examples of a new

ministry of the Spirit to the century of history upon which the land is just about to enter. If the close of the two decades and a half in the life of this Seminary which is marked by this Anniversary could be signalized by the sending forth of thirteen men who believed in "the power of the Spirit only" as the means by which Christ's truth is to triumph — believed it so that they gave their lives to the practical proving and illustrating of it, — it would be worthy fruit of all this quarter-century of theological education. Not less of knowledge or training or labor — but more of the Spirit of God to interfuse this knowledge and training and labor with an energy foreign to mere human nature — springing from the boundless depths of the divine heart and manifesting the resistless movement of the divine will! If he who was with us when the year began — your teacher in the word of God which he so humbly and implicitly believed and which he so vividly and thoroughly expounded — but who to-night in a nobler assembly celebrates a nobler festival than ours, — if he could speak to you from the midst of that uncreated light where there is no seeming, but only endless and perfect vision of the truth, would it not be to say some words like these: "Be first true men of God, possessed by God, subject to God. Seek first God's power, through prayer and obedience. Receive, through faith, the Holy Ghost, the promise of the Father. Then ponder and preach his truth, with the Spirit sent down from heaven, so that your faith and the faith of men may stand, not in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

My brethren, there is a voice that speaks to you, — but it is a better voice than that of any sainted one. It is the voice of him whom Dr. Hackett served on earth, and whom he serves in heaven. The words come echoing down to us from the time when they were first spoken in the upper chamber from which the twelve apostles were to go forth to preach the gospel of the kingdom. They are Christ's words to you also, as you go out to do his work in the world. Listen and you shall hear him saying :— "Peace be unto you! As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

1877:

COURAGE, PASSIVE AND ACTIVE.

Brethren of the Graduating Class :— You have fulfilled your course of preliminary study for the ministry. Your class is the largest ever graduated from the Seminary, yet death has not once invaded your ranks. The last labors of Hackett and Buckland have been spent upon you, and you have joined in our sorrow over their loss. Common chastisements and warnings have drawn us nearer to each other, and to Christ. We will interpret your feelings to-night by our own. Your instructors cannot see this peculiar intimacy of association come to a close without poignant regret. We sorrow that we shall see your faces no more. We have no fears for you. The place you have taken and the work you have done are guarantees under God for your future. That future will hardly be changed by anything I shall say to-night. But knowing how your work looms up before you, and how an

ingenuous mind shrinks from its untried responsibilities, I would fain speak one word in such a tone that it may echo and re-echo down the long reaches of your public career, and, whenever memory repeats it from her walls, may give you new hope and inspiration.

That one word is — Courage. It is a large word. There is a passive courage. It is the Scripture *ὑπομονή* — patience, fortitude, endurance. Nothing more needed, when we have to suffer, or to stand and wait. It is the martyr-spirit. It lives in you, it lives in myriads of believing hearts, though, like smouldering embers, it takes the wild wind of adversity or of persecution to strip it of its ashy crust, and reveal its steady glow. But the martyr is not only a sufferer, — he is a witness. There is something positive and aggressive about him. He gives testimony. And to give testimony requires courage of another sort — active courage — that independent, whole-hearted, outspoken courage which the New Testament calls *παῤῥησία*, or boldness. It is this active courage that I would commend to you. I know that if you have this, you will have the other. If the fire is only kept up, there will be coals enough for the time of need.

And now let me mention three things in which this courage will inevitably manifest itself. The first is, intelligent independence, — I exhort you to this. Not the audacity of questioning or superseding revelation; not the folly and self-sufficiency of ignoring past interpretations of revelation; but the duty of going directly to the sacred oracle to hear what God the Lord will speak. I bid you believe and preach what you find in God's word, though all the theologies of all the world are against you. Value your own opinions formed by humble and prayerful study of the Scriptures. They are as good as any other man's opinions, — at any rate, they are the only opinions of decisive value to you. When you have found the truth, be free to express the truth. Speak it out while you feel it, and as you feel it, without too great particularity of phrase. Show your mind and your heart to men. Be so sincere and transparent and demonstrative that you are willing to blunder. Let no overbearing man, let the terror of no audience, face you down. Have a proper self-confidence. Magnify your office. Make no apologies. Let no man despise your youth. There are a great plenty of men who are run in one mould. In your first creation and in your new creation, God gave you peculiarities of mind and heart and will. He would have you lead a life, and exert an influence for him, in some respects different from that of any other servant of his that ever breathed upon this planet. Have courage then to be yourselves.

Intellectual independence — that is the first manifestation of active courage. The second is, practical force. You may be different from every other human being, yet make no mark to indicate it. Let us be thankful that our national spirit demands of every man positive achievement. Better not live at all, than to do nothing in the world. To be a mere recipient, to spend one's days in self-culture, to float through life artistically reclining upon the cushions of a gondola — this can be tolerated in the old world, but not in the new. It belongs to classic, not to Christian times. "What wilt thou have me to do?" — that is the keynote of the new dispensation. My brethren, God sends you out to accomplish something. You are to make yourselves felt. You are to turn the world upside down. When you take the bow, you

are to let the arrows of divine truth fly full and strong, and straight to the mark. You must put your life into your work. Soul and body must go together. The vast majority of men appreciate nothing purely intellectual. Only through the stir of the emotions, and the physical energy of the man who addresses them, will they be awakened to attend to the truth he preaches. If you cannot reach them by preaching, then reach them by private and personal influence. Be all things to all men, if by any means you may save some. Do not be fettered by traditional rules of ministerial conduct, when these bar your access to men's hearts. Devise new methods, set on foot new enterprises. No Fabian policy, in the conduct of this warfare. Not simply to "hold the fort" that is already ours, but to "storm the fort" of the enemy — for this are we sent. Christ holds us to this putting forth of practical force, this doing of aggressive work, and here is the field for Christian courage.

And now all this would be at the hazard of the preacher's own salvation, if there were not a third work of courage. I mean spiritual living. No one but he who has tried it, knows what courage it takes to live a spiritual life above the average standard of the community or the church. You never know the bitter hostility of the world to Christ, until you see households divided, and enmities occasioned, by simple faithfulness to the Master on the part of some one of his disciples. The church too often is willing to bear the ministrations only of one who will speak kindly of its sins, and not too urgently of its duties. Simply to give to secret prayer the time that is absolutely necessary to nourish one's heart, in this age of predominantly outward activities, requires in the minister a continual struggle. To live so far above his people that this struggle shall have ceased and prayer be his life — this, to the mass of Christians, is unhoped for and almost unheard of sanctity,— and the demand that they should come up to a standard so lofty is an irritating impertinence. To contend against these resisting influences requires that Christ's servant should die daily. Yet without thus contending, how can his ministry be other than a failure? He is to lift men up to a higher life. How can he do this, unless he lives that life himself? Nothing but a high-hearted boldness, a very sublimity of courage, will enable even a minister of the gospel in these days to meet the first and most fundamental demand of his office — the living of a spiritual life.

You know whither these remarks are tending. Christ has made provision for all these sublimities. The passive courage that we term patience, fortitude, endurance; and the active courage which we term independence, force, spirituality,— both these are given to us in Him in whom we are complete. There is a boldness which consists of meekness and humility — the boldness of the man who knows that he has the truth, not his own truth, but God's truth, the truth that the world is dying for, the truth that will stand the test of the last great day; the boldness of the man who, by whatever process, has come to the conviction that God has sent him to proclaim the truth, that a woe is on him if he preach not the gospel, and that eternal woe or eternal blessedness for some who hear him depends upon their acceptance or rejection of the message he brings; the boldness of the man who has implicit confidence in God and in his promises, who believes that God is with him in his preaching, helping him to speak and helping his hearers to

hear, and who therefore declares to men with a solemn rejoicing the whole counsel of God. And this boldness, my brethren, so magnificent in its nature and in its results, the very crown and summit of all gifts of God, this is no dream of a wild imagination, but the rightful possession of every one of us whom Christ has put into his ministry.

Courage, then, in its essence as well as in its etymology, is a matter of the heart — the possession only of him whose heart is one with the heart of Christ. It is not a thing of native endowment alone, nor simply a product of reason and experience. The true courage of the Christian minister has its chief source in that divine Person who has constituted himself the heart of our heart and the life of our life. My brethren, if it were in my power, I would pour out upon you such fullness of grace and strength for the work before you, as should leave you never for a moment conscious of intermittency or lack. What I would do but cannot, Christ can do and will. I point you, to Him as the only and the unfailing source of courage. It is for you now to point others to Him. Do it with such zeal, such determination, such faith, such self-devotion, that over you, when you die, may be said those words which were spoken at John Knox's grave : "Here lies one who never feared the face of man."

1878 :

TRUE DOGMATISM.

Brethren of the Graduating Class :— The Providence of God that has brought you by varied but converging ways, first to your meeting, as students, and now to your parting, has doubtless been preparing your work for you, as well as you for your work. God's Providence and God's Spirit supplement each other. As each age rises, new men arise to take the lead of it and to turn its activities into Christian channels. The preachers of a past generation give place to the preachers of the modern time, because of the great law that men are influenced most by those who are in sympathy with them. The everlasting gospel is everlasting because of its power of endless adaptation to the conditions of the humanity it is to save. And you, who are sent out to teach an age different in some respects from any that has gone before, must in some respects be different men from God's servants in the past, if you are to succeed in your ministry. "Like people, like priest," is a maxim that has a good meaning as well as a bad. As this is an age of intelligence, rapid thinking, hatred of shams, you can mould it for Christ only by being educated, alert and genuine men.

But it is to another point that I wish to call your special attention. It is an age in which all beliefs that take possession of men's minds, whether in science, literature or philosophy, intensely and dogmatically assert themselves. If you would cope with the age's skepticism and indifference, its pre-occupation and hostility, you must meet this assurance of unbelief with the sublimer assurance of faith ; you must believe something with all your heart, and then you must declare it and stand for it, and offer combat to all who come. To this doubting, questioning time, you must present some-

thing beyond all doubt or question — the eternal truth of God, — present it with the true dogmatism of an unwavering faith. Then your faith shall be contagious, and those who hear you shall believe and live.

Is there a body of definite truth for which you may thus safely stand? And has this truth laid hold of you, so that you glory in nothing else but the preaching of it? These are the two great questions. I trust your course of instruction and investigation in this Seminary has settled the first one for you. I know that there are many "winds of doctrine" at present blowing; much doubt whether the apostles fully knew whereof they affirmed, and whether even Christ's teaching was not an accommodation to his times. There are many who question whether we can be sure enough what the New Testament teachings are, to warrant us in drawing a hard and fast line anywhere, and saying "This is truth," and "That is a lie." But just this, John did — that Boanerges whose love could brook no slight upon Christ or his truth. And we have failed in our teaching, if we have not awakened within you a new and profound conviction that a magnificent and organic scheme of doctrine is made known in the Scriptures — a scheme of doctrine whose foundations are the nature and decrees of God, whose various parts have fixed and unchangeable relations to each other, and whose structure towers above all human systems and embraces truth with regard to heaven as well as with regard to earth.

One of the Bampton Lecturers, Garbett by name, has pointed out very clearly a distinct inculcation of this principle by one of the apostles. In an age of heresy and conflict Jude exhorts his readers to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Notice how much is implied here. First, he assumes the existence of a definite and well-known body of truth called "*the faith.*" The belief of the church was not something vague and changeable, but it consisted of a clear and organized mass of religious doctrine, distinctly separable from the errors that assailed it, and recognized by all believers as characteristic of the Christian church. Secondly, this body of truth is characterized by completeness and finality; it is not susceptible of addition or diminution; it is the faith "*once,*" or as it should be translated, "*once for all,* delivered to the saints." Thirdly, there is an authority about it, because it has not originated in human reasonings or in human speculations, but has been given from above; it is "the faith once for all *delivered,*" by God. And fourthly, this faith has been given as a sacred trust to a particular body, namely, the church, that they may keep it and defend it, — the faith has been "delivered *to the saints.*" And thus we, as ministers of the church, are trustees, and into our hands this priceless treasure has been put, to ensure not only its safety and purity, but its universal diffusion through the world. What can humble us, what can exalt us, more than this, that we who are "less than the least of all saints," are yet chosen to be "stewards of the mysteries of God," and that "this grace is given us," that we might present "the unsearchable riches of Christ"!

You have the objective faith — the system of divine truth; have you the subjective faith — the confidence and zeal that will lead you to devote your lives to its propagation and defense? This is the last question. I invite you to severe self-scrutiny, while you answer it. There is much to weaken this faith in our day. The skeptical habit is the prevalent habit of the time.

The oldest and most settled beliefs have become open questions. God and conscience, heaven and hell, are all marked with interrogation-points. Dogmatic reviews have given place to critical journals in which doubters and disputants hold prolonged symposia. Laxity of doctrine — aye, scorn of doctrine — is epidemic. I beg you, stop where you are and go no further toward the work of the ministry, if you are not ready to meet this half-questioning, half-denouncing spirit, with faith in the living Christ and in the absolute truth and saving power of his word. If you have still the idea that Christian doctrine is dead dogma, that it is a human invention instead of a deliverance of God, that it weakens the human intellect instead of nourishing it with its proper food, and fetters the mind instead of expanding it with its vital breath, — in fine, if to contend earnestly for the old faith seems to be dogmatism, in the narrow and mean sense of positiveness where there is no certainty, — then turn back, the pulpit is no place for you. But, if you know whom you have believed, if God has revealed his Son in you, if you have indubitable assurance that the Scripture doctrines of sin and salvation are the very truth of God, then go forward, — declare the whole counsel of God: whoever may refuse to hear, God's Spirit will make your word a word of power, and you shall both save yourselves and those who hear you.

One year ago this evening the class that preceded yours stood in like manner before me. How well we remember one of the members of that class, the manly but gentle, the noble but modest, Albert J. Lyon. As I think of his tall and graceful form, and then of the thorough scholarship and deep devotion that he showed in his Seminary course, I thank God that I was permitted to instruct him. He gave himself to the work of missions. With all the ardor of his ardent nature, he went across the intervening oceans to Christianize and civilize a mountain tribe in Northern Burmah. God spared his life just long enough to permit him to see in the distance the hills where he had expected to labor, and there, before the first year was over, he was called from work to rest, from labor to reward. How pathetically and impressively his example speaks to us to-night! Out from that new-made grave the other side of the sea there comes a voice, speaking to us of the glory of a Christian service performed under the eye and direction of the great Captain of our salvation, even though that service may only be one of suffering and death. May the Spirit that animated him be yours! If you go and continue in that Spirit, your life will not be in vain, even though that life be short.

In this last address, which marks the termination of three years of intimate spiritual and intellectual fellowship — years in which you have commended yourselves individually and collectively to your instructors as candid and faithful Christian men — I bid you for my last admonition to be *true dogmatists;* not dealers in negations, nor fanciers in literature, nor liberalists in doctrine; but positive preachers of a positive faith. Listen to no theory of development which would add to or take from the written word; and yet let every sermon that you preach show that the old truth has had a new and living development in your apprehension and experience. "Be not ashamed of the testimony of our Lord." Be satisfied with the breadth of his mercy. Proclaim his terms of salvation. Preach his gospel as the final and the only hope of the sinner. One only life is given you to live. Let the "Woe is me!" sound through it. Let it be said that for you "to live is Christ."

Then, whether your lives be long or short, whether you labor on Christian or on heathen soil, whether your apparent success be great or small, you will be sure of the "honor that comes from God only." There is a day whose splendors will outshine the brightest triumphs of the world. Not for the present time, with its flatteries and its pleasures, let us live, but for that day when one approving word from Christ our Lord will well repay a life-time of suffering for his truth. With hopefulness, but with solemnity also, go to work as ministers or servants of the word, — for by that word you, as well as those to whom you preach, will be judged at the last day.

1879 :

GOD'S LEADINGS.

Brethren of the Graduating Class :— You have reached the end of a long course of preparatory study. The most of you go now for the first time to be pastors of churches at home, or preachers of the gospel abroad. To all of you, I do not doubt, this breaking with the old, and entrance upon the new, is a time of serious self-examination. You recognize your weakness and unworthiness, and say, "Who is sufficient for these things?" But at this crisis of your lives you feel also the stress of Providence. Another hand has guided you. A thousand converging lines of divine influence find their focus at the spot where you now stand. You perceive that there is no real significance in this hour, unless God has had to do with your past life and will have to do with your future. As you look out upon that future, you see as you never saw before, that you need to be led by God. My last words to you will have this for their subject :— "God's Leadings of His Servants in the Ministry."

There is an external leading of God's Providence, of which the subjects of it are unconscious. He leads the blind by a way that they know not. He ordered your birthplace, your early associations, your later experiences. On some slight influences, such as a casual meeting, the loss of a letter, a shower of rain, a trivial indisposition, the caprice of a friend, you now see that your whole earthly career has been made to depend. What caused you to choose the ministry? A very little thing may have turned your thoughts toward it at the first. As you have gone on in life you have been gathering up the threads of the past and weaving them into a definite pattern. You have begun to see the meaning of incidents in your history which you could not understand years ago. All through David's early life with its varied experiences and wonderful vicissitudes — shepherd-boy, outlaw and monarch, by turns — we see how God was fashioning a heart to sing such songs of sorrow and rejoicing as might be the vehicle of his church's devotions through all coming time. In Luther's obscure origin and literary ambition and monastic struggles, we see how God was preparing a familiar but powerful voice for the great German discontent with Papal corruption of Christianity. God was in the whole complex mass of events that prepared the way for the Jewish kingdom and the Protestant Reformation. But God has been equally in the past influences which have shaped your lives. Evil has been overruled for

your good. Sorrow has softened you. Difficulties have awakened new energy. Even your own sins have shown you your weakness, and the weakness of mere human nature. The way has opened before you, when every earthly power conspired to close it. God has gone before you, as truly as He led those Israelites by a pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night.

On the front of an ancient house in the city of Chester, England, is an inscription that comes down from old Puritan times: "God's Providence is our Inheritance." Take this for your encouragement to-night. If you go on God's errands, God's Providence will work for you. It is hard to preach without this. To stand alone in a universe of evil influences, all combining to thwart your efforts and kill the seed you sow, this is enough to discourage the most earnest and patient soul. But this is not your lot. The minister of Christ has the assurance that all things work together for his good, and for the good of the cause for which he labors. No sooner does he put his hand to God's work, than He to whom all power is given in heaven and earth makes all the forces of the universe conspire to further his labors. No word that he speaks shall be useless. No weapon formed against him shall prosper. His eyes may be blind to them, but there are horses and chariots of fire round about him. The world and life and death are his servants, and the kingdom of God is advanced by his seeming failure, as well as by his seeming success.

It is a great thing to have this external leading of God, and many a stalwart worker has had it without knowing it. But I wish to impress upon you to-night the fact that you may have something better even than this, namely, an internal leading of God — a leading of his Spirit that supplements the leading of his Providence. God's Providences are dark to us, until his Spirit interprets them and brings us into harmony with them. But it is possible to see God's hand in the events of every day, to discern the signs of the times, to be filled with the knowledge of God's will. This is the work of the Holy Spirit. As I have said to you elsewhere, he interprets to us God's Providences as he interprets to us God's Scripture. He presses our own powers into the service. He energizes our own faculties, so that we exercise a common-sense that after all is very uncommon, and a judgment free from selfish bias. And the result is that while we never allow ourselves to act blindly or irrationally, but accustom ourselves to weigh evidence with regard to duty, the Holy Spirit gives us an understanding of circumstances, a sense of God's providential purposes with regard to us, which makes our true course plain to ourselves, although we may not always be able to explain it to others. So God points out to us the place, the time, and the method of our work. No great servant of God has ever lived who was not at times seized with a spirit of desire and prayer, such as no powers of his own nature could account for, and then with impulses to do and dare for God, such as worldly men and even uninstructed Christians would call madness. But wisdom is justified of her children, and myriads of times in the history of his church, God has shown that the seeming madness was foresight, and that the audacity of his servants has struck blows for truth that resounded throughout the world.

Do you know anything more magnificent, my brethren, than a life in which the external leading of God's Providence is accompanied by a constant internal leading of his Spirit? Do you think it some extraordinary and

inaccessible grace, to which you may not aspire? Not so. "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." This grace belongs by right to all ministers and to all Christians. You believe in each element separately. I call upon you, as the condition of highest success in your ministry, to believe in both at once and together. Realize your relation to Christ, and you *can* believe in them; for Christ is not only the external ruler and administrator of God's providential government, but he is also the inspirer and director of his people. In Christ, the two poles touch, and like the positive and negative wires of a battery, their meeting results in the light and heat of an intelligent Christian activity. Christ outside of us by his Providence pushes on the whole mass and movement of the world; Christ inside of us, by his Spirit, pushes *us* on, so that we keep abreast of our time — nay, lead it — for Him, to his own ends of glory and salvation.

To be up with the times, in this sense, is truly to live. A ministry that is not thus led by God is worse than useless. One touch of God's finger can give you more of strength than all the self-moved efforts of a life-time. The inspiration of the Almighty can give you more understanding than all the wisdom of this world without it. Will you, by obedience and purity, keep yourselves open to divine suggestions, or will you go out to your work in the impotence of your own natural powers, to misrepresent Christ, to lead astray the immortal beings who look to you for guidance, and perchance to be castaways yourselves? Brethren, I am persuaded better things of you than this. I hear you cry with Moses, "If thy presence go not with me, carry me not up hence!" And I hear God's voice of answer, "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest!"

Go then, my brethren, to the solemn work before you, strong in the Lord and in the power of his might. Because you have God's Providence for your backer, be hopeful and aggressive. Because God's Spirit leads you on, let no rebuffs or defeats dishearten you. Persist and conquer. God will provide places for you, just as soon as you are prepared for places. Seek them from God, more than you seek them from men. Hold them as God-given, when once God brings them to you. So, serving your apprenticeship to his ministry in your early years, and serving your generation by his will through life, you will find at last, with a great number who have been saved through your labors, that as Christ by his Providence and Spirit has prepared you for heaven and a crown of righteousness, so he has prepared heaven and a crown of righteousness for you. With the earnest prayer that this may be so with each of you, I bid you, for myself and on behalf of the Faculty of the Seminary, an affectionate farewell.

1880:

SELF-MASTERY.

Brethren of the Graduating Class:— When our Lord sent out his eleven disciples to subdue the world, there was only one thing that prevented its looking like the prelude to a tragedy, and that was that they obeyed him. A few perfectly disciplined soldiers are stronger than a mob, and a little band

of Christians who move at the word of Christ can beat down all opposition. As you go out to-night to reinforce the noble army of his ministers, we have hope for you because we trust that you have got yourselves under control. We know that if you have mastered yourselves, you can master the world. And this is the theme of the few remarks I make to you in parting :— Self-mastery essential to power in the ministry.

What sort of self-mastery, each one of you knows for himself better than I can tell him. All your experience and all my teaching has been in vain, if you have not learned that self is our worst enemy ; that Satan has no power over us except when he finds an ally within us ; that this traitorous element inside the citadel lurks in different places in different men ; and that, wherever this is, there the fight for self-mastery must be fought. Christian ministers may find their besetting sin in the indulgence of bodily appetites. An excessive vitality may find mere common food and drink a source of temptation. Defective vitality may look to stimulants for strength. Constitutional indolence may need the continual spur of strenuous resolve. Excitable passions may need the constant bridle of watchfulness and prayer. I say to you, my brethren, that if you cannot conquer yourselves, on this lowest plane of mere physical habits, the ministry is no work for you. No man can bring others into subjection to Christ, so long as he is a slave himself. He need not be an ascetic, but he must keep the body under — like the boxer, strike it under the eye and make it his servant — lest, after having preached to others, he should be himself a castaway.

There is another sort of self-mastery which pertains to the intellectual being. There is no success in the ministry, for the man who cannot use his own mind. The preacher who compels the attention of this intensely active generation must know how to think. Thoughts, and not pious phrases, must be the staple of his public address. But thinking, until it becomes habit and delight, is the hardest of work. The power of thinking can be attained only by giving over the nursing of one's moods, and by setting one's self resolutely to do each day's task of study or of prayer. Let me exhort you from the very beginning of your ministry to have your fixed hours — the earliest and the best hours — for actual grappling with the great subjects of preaching. Abhor dawdling. Give yourselves no rest, until you have made your minds facile instruments to do your bidding. There is no recipe for driving out evil, like keeping the mind full of the good. Enthusiastic absorption of one's self in study and in work will scatter the whole brood of low desires and frivolous ambitions which crowd into every vacant corner of the soul and clamor for dominion. Of all men, the minister of Christ needs most to keep his own heart, lest the voice of flattery, or the love of power, or the attractions of society, or the pursuit of abstract truth, or even the selfish seeking of his own personal religious joy, should draw him aside from his one duty of publishing Christ. The surface of the ocean which men can see is nothing to the great invisible depths. God demands the consecration to himself of the hidden world of the thoughts. And no Christian minister is safe himself, or a safe teacher of others, who does not feel the deep necessity of bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.

There are other regions still in which self-mastery is a condition of success, but I can mention only those which have to do with the will, and which

require not so much active exertion as they do submission. Many a man fails in life because he is bent on acting upon some merely ideal plan, and is unwilling to work under actual conditions. This is rebellion against divine Providence, and argues pride and selfishness — not nobility of purpose. The first lesson for the statesman and for the pastor alike is that he must take things as they are, and consult the practicable. He may do this, without at all lowering his standard of right, or altering in the least his fixed determination to realize that right in ultimate practice. But he has certain constitutional limitations of talent; his opportunities are narrower than he might desire; his helpers may be few. He may find that he is misapprehended and opposed; that those for whom he works need a process of education, before they can accept his standards or enter into his plans; that the imperfections and negligences of Christians are directly in his way. There are two wrong methods of dealing: first, that of denunciation, and secondly, that of despair. The first is the failure of passion; the second, the failure of unbelief. The servant of the Lord, on the one hand, must not strive,— ill-temper is confession of defeat; nor, on the other hand, must he abandon the conflict,— abandonment *is* defeat. But the true way is the way that is hardest to mere human nature — the way of self-restraint, of patient preparation for victory, of giving up one's own will and plan, for the time, until others can be trained to adopt and further it. Our democratic church-polity is a very good system for very good people. But sometimes the people are not very good. Then our polity is the best of all schools for the minister. But how will he ever pass the test, unless he has learned to rule his own spirit? Xenophon tells us that the youthful Cyrus was taught to obey, in order that he might know how to command. Be willing to bide your time, my brethren. Do not let the first breath of trouble in your churches frighten you from your posts. Stand by; be masters of yourselves, though it cost you days of bitterness; hold on to God and to the truth, and your submissive persistence, your humble boldness, your contagious faith, will bring even your enemies to rally as one man to your support, or will deprive them of all power to hinder your triumph. These victories over self are the greatest victories gained in this world. No pæans are sung over them, but God sees them and blesses them, and the conquest of their own wills, on the part of his ministers, is the precursor of conquest for the cause which they serve.

These are the various spheres in which the minister of Christ must be master of himself. Why must he thus conquer himself? Because this only can give him conscious sincerity. No man can fight a devil outside of him, when he is harboring that same devil in his own heart. He must cast out the devil from within, or the outward struggle will be only a pretense. And he will be more or less conscious that it is a pretense. It is a dreadful thing to face — those hundreds of scrutinizing eyes that peer into your soul from the public audience — a dreadful thing to face, when you are not quite honest with yourself. You thought you were going to brave it out, with superficial fervors or with curious intellectualisms. But ah, the very sinews of your strength are cut,— you are divided against yourself; the secret sin is blazoned before your eyes, if not before the eyes of your congregation; you might as well be dumb, so far as effective speech is concerned. What you want is such conscious sincerity as shall enable you to throw yourself and

your whole life without reserve into the battle,— but a miserable simulacrum and shell of yourself is all that is left you. And so we have the preaching of compromises — compromises with fashionable customs, with smoothly-named immoralities, with current skepticisms, with novelties in church-order or church-disorder. The truth is, that no man can possibly preach the cross of Christ and all that cross represents, unless he has been and is crucified with Christ in his own personal life. The Jesuits did well when they prefaced all public work by that long retreat for self-mortification and self-renunciation. And the Church, the true Society of Jesus, should not think its ministers qualified for service, until they have so mastered themselves as to bear about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus.

Only such self-mastery can enable the preacher to impress others. Men look at the preacher, and their first question is: "What is there in him? Has he any religion — anything different from what we have ourselves?" He needs to answer that question by showing in his own person two things: first, the penetration and spirituality of God's law; and, secondly, the conquering power of the personal Christ. How can he be an example of what God requires, unless in his measure he presents like Christ the law of God drawn out in living characters? How can he be an example of what Christ can accomplish, unless he shows in himself that desires and affections, habits and inclinations, which he once could not conquer, are brought now into subjection, and that he is a victor, inviting others to come and share in his triumph and rejoicing? Oh, my brethren, the young men of your congregations will learn more from your personal habits of self-indulgence or self-denial, than they will ever learn from your sermons! Only as Christ leads you in triumph, will you be able to induce others to swell his conquering train. And your preaching, whether true or false, cannot be indifferent in its results. It will either be a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death. Most of all, it is important to remember that only the self-ruling spirit can secure for a minister the favor and blessing of God. For God sees the heart. He knows whether it is truly submitted to him; though man may not see through disguises, God does. We have learned, I trust, that it is not our talent or administration that wins true success, but only the mighty working of his Spirit. Oh, the absurdity and madness of expecting success in the ministry, when our own being is a chaos of warring elements, not subject to our true selves nor to God, and so not able or worthy to be made the channel for God's grace to flow in to others! It was well for Mr. Moody that he resolved to show in himself how much God was willing to do through a man perfectly consecrated to his service. Are you willing, my brethren, to bring your whole being under control, in order that God's Spirit in its fullness may rest upon you?

And now how may this self-mastery be acquired? We do not endanger the divine side of the truth, when we say that there is requisite a resolute will. Christianity does not make man a self-less organ of God's working. We are not to lose our wills, but, in a true sense, to have more of will than ever before. God works in and through man's working. Your true selves must rise up against the false, and put these down. But then all this, in sole dependence upon him who worketh in us. In Christ alone do we find our true selves,— in him alone attain real freedom and power. This truth

of union with Christ, as you well know, has been the centre and burden of my teaching. I bring you to it once more at this critical moment of your lives, when like the king of Babylon, you stand at the parting of the ways. In that truth lies the solution of all mysteries, the answer to all perplexities, the overcoming strength for all conflicts, and specially for the conflict with yourselves. You desire to know how you may attain this self-mastery? The answer is: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with its affections and lusts." Christ has himself conquered, and he waits to make you partakers of his victory. By faith receive him, and you shall be more than conquerors through him that loved you. Only the Son of God, joining his almighty wisdom and strength to yours, can enable you to subdue yourselves. But he is able to save, unto the uttermost, all them that come to God through him.

My dear brethren, we have loved you, and have followed your course with the deepest interest, until now. But love itself prompts us, as we look on toward your future, to reiterate this one precept, that you prepare for work outside of you, by work in your own souls. The life that is before you is but a little thing, and soon over. It may be a mere beating of the air, with nothing done, at the end of it. There may be less of purity and strength at the end, than at the beginning; less of thought and of power, both in preaching and in life. Or, it may be the constantly widening battle-field and victory of a constantly stronger combatant — a combatant more believing, more successful, more humble — as the years pass on. And beginnings make endings. He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much. Beginning in your own heart and mastering that for Christ, then carrying your victorious arms into the small field of your first service and winning that also for your Redeemer, you shall be preparing for yet wider conflicts and wider responsibilities. For though beginnings *make* endings, they are not themselves the endings. These last are beyond the sphere of sense and time. There, he who has been faithful over a few things shall be ruler over many things, and they who have mastered self and the world shall be advanced to positions of high responsibility in God's great empire. There are bad endings and good endings. In the case of every one of you, may God prevent the former; may he grant the latter! Preaching Christ's gospel, may you save both yourselves and those who hear you! And may you have the evidence and pledge of this final victory, in the present daily and hourly conquest of yourselves!

1881:

MENTAL QUALITIES REQUISITE TO THE PASTOR.

Brethren of the Graduating Class:— Some years ago there was placed upon the *Index Prohibitorius* at Rome, a book which bore this title: "The Priesthood a Chronic Disorder of the Human Race." It was a skeptical book. It protested against churches, because they so easily became machines; against pastors, because they so easily became bishops. And yet the refutation of the book was in its title. When the priesthood was called a chronic

disorder of the human race, it was confessed that there is an instinct in humanity which prompts it to seek religious guidance. The inference should have been that a wise and benevolent God will somewhere provide a supply for this need in a true ministry of his word.

You go out to-night to meet this crying want of humanity, and you go believing that God calls you. We share this confidence with you. We are glad that so many churches are to receive as pastors men so good and true as you have proved yourselves to be. We have done what we can for you, and in many respects you are well furnished for your work. But there is a training which books can never give. There are good gifts which teachers can never impart. And this suggests the subject of my brief parting address : — The mental qualities requisite to the highest success in the pastorate. Notice that I speak of qualities requisite, not for success in preaching only, but for success in the whole work of influencing men, whether in public or in private. Notice that I do not say "requisite to success," but "requisite to the highest success." You must not be discouraged if you seem to yourselves to be almost lacking in one or another of these qualities. Notice that I do not say "spiritual qualities," but "mental qualities." I speak of those only which at least in some degree belong to you by nature, and which it is quite in your power to cultivate. Indeed, to a thoughtful mind, one of the chief attractions of the pastorate is the stimulus it furnishes to the very characteristics of mind and heart which I am about to mention. The very work of the pastor for others draws out all parts of his own nature, and makes him a living example of well-rounded and developed manhood.

The pastor is a shepherd, and the business of a shepherd is to care for the flock. He is to care for them by being a teacher and example of the truth. Now one of the most important of the mental qualities required for this work is *frankness*. The minister of the gospel should not be a man of concealments or evasions. In his preaching he should think right, and then he should say out what he thinks. He should be open-minded to receive truth, and then he should be open-minded to communicate it. No human creature is more despised by discerning men than the trimmer, or the man of policy, in the pastorate. They feel that converse with the things of eternity ought to give him strong convictions, boldness of utterance, freedom from the trammels of party. He should be willing to tell men their faults, if need be. He is to "reprove, rebuke, exhort," as well as to invite and comfort. If you have the Spirit of Christ, and exercise a wise moderation, you can do this without repelling those whom you seek to influence. They will respect the man who deals squarely with them. Be sure that in your private intercourse with your church there be nothing underhanded. Abhor all wire-pulling and indirection. Have good ends, and go straight at them. No toadying, and no mock humility. Let no man despise your youth. Take responsibility. Stand forth, and do your work. None but a manly religion is worth the having. You wish to cultivate the open and sincere spirit in others. Show them an example of noble Christian frankness in yourselves.

But there can be a frankness that is oppressive and discouraging. It is not the fault-finding tendency, which I would have you cultivate. Add to your frankness, therefore, as the second quality of mind requisite to the highest pastoral success, a *hopefulness* of spirit. The best men tire at last

of minute and incessant criticism. We are saved by hope, and we must try to put hope into those we teach. You are not to be prophets of lamentation, nor is it your main business to denounce. Many a man's failure in the ministry has been due to the fact that he had no confidence in the Christian character of his hearers. He has dealt with them as if they were reprobates, instead of taking it for granted that they were subjects of God's grace — imperfect indeed, but still on the whole intending, when they know God's will, to do it. Such dark views with regard to the condition of the church are often born of an arrogant and self-righteous spirit. Paul took for granted that the Corinthians were saints, and in beginning his epistles he called them so. And Paul was not only a gentleman, but a Christian. If you would make men better, you must recognize the good which God has wrought in them already. Praise your people, then, more than you blame them. Show, in public and in private, that you appreciate what they do for you and for the cause. Tell them, not only of their failings, but of their excellencies of character, as Paul did. Speak, not only of needs, but of possibilities. Set over against the depth of sin the infinite riches of the believer in Christ. In practical matters, take a cheerful view of the situation. Joy wins more hearts then tears ever did. A mournful and ascetic Christianity belies its very name. Go to your work, then, confident that you will win. Be hopeful men,— or, if you are by nature despondent, keep your despondency to yourselves, as a weakness and a sin. Be careful not to utter your moodiness and your fears, for utterance reacts upon the spirit that prompted it and makes it more intense. Since it is Christ and no human leader whom you follow, be persuaded that he will lead you to conquest. We can believe all things, because Christ is our hope.

And yet it is possible for a pastor to be frank and hopeful, while at the same time he is hard. Frankness and hopefulness may make him rash. A driving energy is quite consistent with an unfeeling self-will. As the third quality of mind requisite to the highest pastoral success, therefore, I would urge you to add to your frankness and hopefulness, a true *sympathy*. I do not mean a maudlin sentimentality ; I do not mean an unctuous graciousness ; I do not mean a quivering sensibility. The sympathy to be cultivated must be calm. There should be a certain dignity and sobriety in it. It should be a hearty, manly fellow-feeling, that shows itself in helpful words and helpful deeds. Who can estimate the power of it, in a pastor ! To be the true friend of all his flock, to have compassion for the erring, interest in the poor, a smile for the children, a word in season for the weary, a tear for the bereaved — this is the pastor's mission ; this will so knit him to his church, that separation will seem like death. True sympathy can never be put on ; it is an inward grace, a virtue of the heart. A kind natural disposition is much ; but the tenderness of soul which Christ gives to the penitent and saved sinner is more. No merely natural sympathy is equal to the demands of your work, my brethren. Paul never could have so longed after his converts, except, as he himself says, "in the heart of Jesus Christ." Joined to Christ, as he was, he was capable of entering into other's griefs and needs, as he never could have done without. Unostentatious, yet untiring, his love passed all selfish bounds ; he will love them the more, the less he be loved. And this is the first question which your people will ask of you,

namely, "Has he a Christian heart in him? Does he love Christ, and love his people? Has he the instinct of the shepherd, to support the weak, comfort the sorrowing, seek the lost?" May our Lord give you this power of sympathy, and enable you to comfort others with the comfort with which you yourselves are comforted of God.

And now these remarks must come to a close. I trust you have seen the inner connection of them. I have been speaking of mental gifts — frankness, hopefulness, sympathy. I have been urging you to be open, cheerful, warm of spirit. You have doubtless recognized that these natural gifts are but the obverse human side of those lofty graces of the Holy Spirit which the Apostle to the Gentiles has joined forever in triple union, namely, faith, hope, and love. And so we have indicated the true source of these human excellencies of character. Faith will give us frankness; hope will give us cheerfulness; love will give us sympathy. Remember the divine Author of them, and look to him. You may easily have your natural frankness turned to suspicious reticence; your youthful cheer darkened into fearful forebodings; your ready sympathies chilled into hardness of heart, — and all this by the misapprehensions and disappointments and hostilities of life. You need a higher and more constant source of supply than the inspirations of your own hearts. Such a supply you have in the omnipotent Spirit of Christ, — for the faith, hope and love which he imparts abide forever.

We expect you to be a class of preachers. You have shown that you have tastes and gifts in this direction. But remember that you are called to be pastors also, and accept this last word of exhortation in which we urge you to seek from God, and to cultivate by effort of your own, the frankness, hopefulness and sympathy needful to the best success. As you have the source of these qualities in the Spirit, so you have the model of them in Christ — the frankest, most hopeful, most sympathetic, of all shepherds of the sheep. Follow Christ's example. Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost shall make you overseers, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood. To this work we now dismiss you. May you so perform it, as to reflect honor upon this training school of Christian pastors! May you so perform it, to the very end, that when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, you shall receive, at his hands, a reward more welcome than any earthly praise — the crown of glory that never fades away!

1882 :

ADAPTATION.

Brethren of the Graduating Class :— It is something to have finished your course in this Seminary. It argues industry, persistence, capacity. We congratulate you. But it is something more, at the end of life to say, "I have finished my course," and to look back upon the battle fought and the victory won. What is the relation between the work of the Seminary and the work of life? It is the relation between science and art, between principles and practice. Here you have learned the theory of religion, —

there you are to carry out the theory, and to apply it. It is vain to say that the preacher can get along without theology. He needs a knowledge of theology more than the lawyer needs knowledge of law, or the physician needs knowledge of medicine. For theology is nothing more than the connected exhibition of the facts of God's word. An infidel lecturer has recently said that the Aurora Borealis is beautiful, but that it is a poor light to grow corn by. God's truth, however, is not a shifting Aurora, but a steady sunlight, and no corn can be grown without sunshine. You have been getting possession of this truth, or rather, it has been getting possession of you. The great doctrines of man's guilt and ruin, and of God's free grace in Christ, have assumed new meaning and dignity as you have studied them. They have moulded your characters. You have seen their power in others. Now you go to test this truth in a larger field, and in a more independent way. Your success will depend, in great part, upon your skill in turning the abstract into the concrete, and in applying it to living minds and hearts. My parting counsel to you is that you study *adaptation*.

A minister of the last generation was once asked by a youthful preacher how he should overcome his excessive timidity in presence of his congregation. The older advised his younger brother to think of his audience as a lot of cabbages planted in rows before him. It is a good illustration of the impersonal quality attributed to the preaching of that day. God was conceived to be the only speaker — the only agent. Ministers and people alike were but so many cabbages. We protest against this ignoring of the intellects and wills of men, — it leaves to God no moral realm in which to work. We urge on the contrary, as essential to the preacher's success, the recognition of varieties among his auditors, and his duty to feed each one with food convenient for him. Milk for babes, meat for the full-grown, — to each his portion in due season. He that winneth souls is wise, and his wisdom largely consists in bringing out of his store things new or old, according to the special needs of his hearers. There is a sense, of course, in which Christ is the one and only need of the soul. But in him is an infinite fullness, all the treasures of wisdom. He is to be presented in all his offices, in all his relations, as the friend of the poor, the comforter of the sorrowing, the children's teacher, the refuge of the doubting, the forgiver of sin, the guide through life, the hope of heaven. All human institutions are to be brought under Christ's control. His gospel touches life everywhere, and is to be applied to its regulation and uplifting. As in public worship, by a process of synthesis, the minister is to gather together all the wants and woes of his congregation, and present them before God in prayer, so in his preaching, by a reverse process of analysis, he should bring the truth of God to bear by turns upon every relation of life, yes, even upon the spiritual condition of each individual soul. He is a physician of souls, and if he be a true one, he will recognize the fact that no two cases under his care are just alike, that no one treatment will do for all the maladies which sin brings in its train, that each patient presents a new and peculiar opportunity for the exercise of his healing art.

Allowing, then, the need of adaptation in preaching, how shall we secure it? It seems to me that much can be learned from a study of Christ's own methods. Never in all the world was there such illustration of the "word

in season," as in Christ's teaching. To him every conjuncture of circumstances was an opportunity, and no opportunity was ever lost. As you listen to his words, you perceive that he made every occasion great. A most intense and vivid personality seems to discern, as by a divine insight, the distinct and solitary personality of each soul with which it deals, and so, knowing what is in man, Christ speaks to that soul words that as precisely meet his need, as if there were none other in the universe to whom they could apply. So in general, the word of God searches us out, and says, "Thou art the man." We must study its directness, its particularity, its exactness of adaptation to each varying shade of human character and condition.

But we should also, by a process of spiritual diagnosis, acquaint ourselves with the mental traits and religious difficulties of our hearers,— for we cannot lay claim to any intuitive or divine knowledge. We must study human nature, not in a general way, but by close observation and prolonged thought of the dispositions, habits, failings, troubles, temptations, of those to whom we minister. We should encourage them to make known their wants and their aspirations. We should talk over with them beforehand the subjects we propose to preach upon for their benefit, so that every sermon shall have a living interest to us, and at least to some one soul among our hearers. Casuistry and the confessional have had their dark and hideous side. The Christian preacher may have the good of both, by discussing the principles upon which any given case of conscience is to be decided, and by having an open ear and an open heart to the acknowledgments and resolves of those who long for some earthly confidant and adviser. All this implies much and constant pastoral work, and shows how impossible it is to separate the faithful preacher from the faithful pastor. He cannot preach to the heart, or from the heart, without having first got into the heart. He must know his people, in order to adapt God's truth to their special needs. And he can know his people, only by prayerfully studying the special cases that come before him in his work as pastor.

A single word with regard to the results of this effort to secure adaptation. However imperfectly it may succeed, it will certainly give a reality and effectiveness to preaching which would be impossible without it. The sermon of a year ago will not do now,— it must be made over, pitched to a new key, furnished with new points of connection, illustrated from the events of to-day, sent home to some new hearts by words that revive its memories or suggest its needs. Dronings and abstractions will cease from the pulpit, when every preacher has in his heart and puts into his sermon the spirit of the text, "To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." There will be a manliness of utterance, a sympathy, an earnestness of appeal, when the preacher talks no longer to men in the mass, but feels in his very soul that he is addressing live and palpitating human hearts, aye, sometimes even performing upon them a work of spiritual vivisection, though the surgery may be kind and with intent to heal. True adaptation in preaching will save us from sensationalism on the one hand — the essence of which is the exhibition of the preacher, — for the preacher will be lost in the thought of others and of the truth which will help and save them. On the other hand, it will save us from preaching over our people's heads — addressing some superhuman or inhuman ideal of human nature, while the particular

cases before us are ignored or forgotten. The philosophy that pays no attention to facts may be very brilliant and lofty, but it is very cold and useless, — it is also very narrow. Breadth in preaching is only to be cultivated by letting it reflect the endless variety of the phases of truth and life, as we find them in the great heart of man, and in the heart of Him in whose image we are made.

We honor Christ and his living word, then, when we seek to show their adaptations to the special wants of men. System is good, but it is good for nothing when it becomes an idol, when it is preached for itself alone. I urge you to be doctrinal preachers, but doctrinal only in the most practical sense, — men who make doctrine a power to move the will to obedience to Christ. I do not know a more glorious vocation than that of preaching such a gospel in such a way, of sounding all the heights and depths of human experience, of applying the truth of God to all varieties of men so as to heal all sorts of blight and ruin in the soul, to summon forth all sorts of beauties of character, and to elicit all sorts of praises for Him who has made and redeemed mankind. May God go with you as you go upon this mission, my brethren. May he give you much of his Spirit. May he enable you to adapt your proclamation of the old and unchanging truth to the conditions and needs of individual men, so that a multitude shall be led to Christ through your ministry, and so that your work shall be an integral part of that collective ministration of the church by which to principalities and powers in heavenly places shall be make known the manifold wisdom of God.

1883 :

FAITH THE MEASURE OF SUCCESS.

Brethren of the Graduating Class :— Your days of pupilage are now over, and you are soon to be teachers of the churches. You have been good learners here, and this past docility is a guarantee of future power. Before any man can preach the gospel, he must receive it as a little child. We trust that you thus receive God's truth. You do not create the truth, — God gives it to you. Let me now, in these closing words of counsel, remind you that the measure of your faith, in accepting the truth and proclaiming it, will be the measure of your success as ministers of Christ.

A different doctrine from this is broached of late — the doctrine that reason, and not Scripture, is the final standard of appeal. In recent discussions with regard to Eschatology, it has been maintained that plain Biblical statements must be denied their full weight in determining our faith, because we cannot bring them into harmony with our conceptions of human freedom. Not only is everlasting punishment relegated to the category of questionable doctrines, but, upon the same ground that they are inconsistent with certain assumed metaphysical or moral principles, the doctrine of a common sin of the race in Adam and the doctrine of a veritable bearing of the penalty of sin in Christ, are declared to be absurd and outworn errors. Instead of asking what Scripture says, and taking that as binding upon our faith and our con-

science, reason is first to determine what is worthy of God, and to take that only for Scripture.

I know well, from our intercourse in private as well as in the lecture-room, that this pernicious view is held by no one of you. But there are forms of words frequently used which seem to imply it, although those who use them would abhor this conclusion. Is reason the criterion of religious truth? In a certain sense, yes; in the sense of these critics, no. We can know nothing except by our reason,—for the reason is the mind's whole power of knowing. But this is a very different thing from saying that we can know nothing except by our reasoning faculty, for the reasoning or logical faculty is but a small part of the reason. My whole intuitional nature, with all my powers of sense-perception and of belief in testimony, lies outside the domain of mere reasoning or logic. While reason, in the larger sense, may be the criterion of truth, mere reasoning never can be. I am obliged to accept a thousand facts, in nature and in my own soul, which I can never explain. I take them for true, because *reason* tells me they are true, not because *reasoning* tells me so.

Now this testimony of my own nature is trustworthy, because it is the testimony of God, who made my nature. God is truth, and truth is God. Hence the only ultimate criterion of truth is God and God's revelations. My nature is a criterion of truth, only as it is in the image of God. When my nature becomes perverted, it misrepresents God,—as the colored glass misrepresents the landscape, or as the chromatic aberration of the telescope misrepresents the stars. Then Christ, the true image of God, the true human nature, becomes the real criterion of truth to me, and when he who is the Eternal Word speaks his words to me, I am bound to listen, believe, and obey.

Or, put it in another form. God alone is truth, and only God can make known himself, or the truth, to any human creature. How am I to judge of what God, or truth, is? Only by what God has told me. How has God told me? First, by his revelation in nature, including my own constitution; secondly, by his revelation in Scripture. Can I perfectly trust the first? Yes, so far as God has made himself known in it,—provided my constitution is not impaired or blinded by sin. But here are two fatal difficulties: There are many things I need to know, which God has not made known in nature, and many of those which he has made known I cannot rightly discern, on account of the diseased condition of my spiritual vision. Both on account of natural weakness and of moral perversity, my reason is fallible. I am like a man partially blind. Some things I must take upon testimony. So my ultimate criterion of truth must be, not my own reason, but the Scriptures; not what God tells me in my own nature, for that voice is greatly weakened and obscured, but what God tells me clearly and externally in his written word.

I should be the last to deny — rather I should be the first to maintain — that in all this process reason is active. It is reason that must feel her own weakness and need of superior help; it is reason that must examine the credentials of the revelation that professes to supply this need; it is reason that must accept this revelation and reduce its facts to order and system; in this sense, reason is a preliminary criterion of truth. But reason is not the ultimate criterion of truth, because her last utterance and her highest wisdom are to confess her insufficiency, to resign her place of authority, and to

make way for a mightier and clearer revelation of God — the revelation of God in the Bible. Henceforth it is the part of reason, not to criticize, but to submit.

To go further than this, and to assert for reason the right to accept or to reject whatever of Scripture may suit her preconceptions or her fancies — this is to abuse reason. Of all methods of human thought, rationalism is the most irrational. To make reason the ultimate criterion of truth, is to assert that the finite mind can comprehend and challenge the infinite; that reason is the superior and truth the inferior; that the corrupted revelation of God in my nature is more trustworthy than that perfect law of the Lord which converts the soul; that, because man was once made in the image of God, we can now construct God in the image of corruptible man. Thank God, God's power of giving is infinitely greater than man's power of receiving, and my power to take in is not the limit or the criterion of truth. Reason is not a latent omniscience, is not a power of discovering or of judging all truth, but in its highest activities is rather a power of taking what is freely given to it by Him who, with his revelation, provides also the Spirit of truth to enlighten our minds and enlarge our faculties to take it in.

Faith, then, whether in God or in God's word, is the highest act of reason; and this reason, although it is a preliminary criterion of truth, is not the ultimate criterion. God's word is the only final standard of appeal. To the law and to the testimony, — if reason speaks not according to their voice, it is because there is no light in her. With all my heart I congratulate you, my brethren, that you have this sure and safe rule by which to test your erring fancies, and to measure the new utterances that claim your credence and support. We live in a day when the old truths are questioned, when the world's faith is unsettled, when multitudes bow to nothing as ultimate authority. Satan's suggested doubt as to the inspiration of the word: "Yea, hath God said?" is followed, as in Eden, by the open denial, "Ye shall not surely die." The rejection of eternal punishment and the rejection of the Bible go together, and both errors proceed from the apotheosis of human reason and its elevation above God's word. The man who enters the ministry, professing to be a teacher of Christian truth and a steward of the mysteries of God, while yet he attributes greater weight to the conclusions of his own reason than he gives to the plain declarations of Scripture, or who interprets Scriptural utterances in some non-natural sense instead of bowing to them as the end of all controversy, enters the ministry with a lie in his right hand, and can hope to be only a propagator of dishonesty and a means of ruin to the souls whom he misleads. But the man who accepts the whole word of God as inspired, and fairly interpreting it declares the whole counsel of God to men, will not only save himself and those who hear him, but will find at last that he builded better than he knew, that his utterances were infinitely more true than he thought, that death, judgment and eternity witness to their divine and everlasting validity.

All other human callings have to do mainly with local and temporal interests, and the truth with which they deal is of a partial and inferior sort. It is the glory of your calling, my brethren, that you are to preach that word of God which liveth and abideth forever, and by which you and your hearers alike are to be judged at the last day. It is a sublime vocation. I pray you,

value your inestimable privilege. And may Christ, who is himself the truth, give you grace to preach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so long as he gives you breath, and, when death comes, may you be able to say, with Paul, that you have kept the faith and that you have won the crown.

1884 :

HABITS IN THE MINISTRY.

Brethren of the Graduating Class :— The Faculty of the Seminary desire to express to you their appreciation of the faithful work you have done during the past three years, and their high hopes for your future. Other things being equal, industry and regularity in one's preparatory training determine his after success. The habits of the past will follow you as you go into your new life. If you have been faithful in little, you will probably be faithful in much. Some of you may be conscious that you have not done your utmost in your Seminary course. Still you have the opportunity to mend. New habits can be formed. As a theme of encouragement or admonition to all, think then for a moment of habits — what they are, what sorts of them need to be cultivated, how this cultivation is to be managed, how results justify this cultivation.

A habit is nothing more nor less than a decision of the will so repeated that it becomes easy. You are familiar with the law by which the action of one faculty affects all the others. Every volition has its influence upon the ideas and upon the feelings, and these last are motives to new volition. Volitions, therefore, tend to repeat themselves,— the oftener they are put forth, the more likely it is that they will be put forth again. What is done at first with an effort, comes at last to be done spontaneously. And so our habits are the surest indications of character, because they are the settled movements of the soul. Each one of them represents a thousand consolidated volitions. A good habit is a tremendous power for good. Evil habits are the very fetters of the evil one. One of the greatest of our moral tasks, therefore, is to turn isolated or sporadic action into habitual action, or in other words, to give our transient decisions for the right the continuity and moral force of habits. And there is no pursuit in life where this automatic movement of our powers is more indispensable to success than in the ministry.

There are certain habits which I urge you to form at the very beginning of your ministerial life. One of them is the devotion of a solid hour at the beginning of each day to study of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. Become masters of the Greek Testament. Begin your work at it the very first morning that you reach the place of your first settlement. Keep it up, summer and winter, rain or shine, sermon or no sermon, sick or well. You are to be primarily teachers of God's word; you must know that word through and through; you must be full of it; you must be mighty in the Scriptures. But this you cannot be, unless you devote a part of the best time of every day to study of the Bible, apart from any special work of preparation for the pulpit.

Another habit which I would recommend you to cultivate from the very first is the homiletical habit. And by this I mean the habit of seizing upon every novel truth of Scripture, every suggestion of theological or scientific literature, every instructive or bright remark heard in conversation, every exigency in public affairs or in the private fortunes of those about you, every unfolding of your own needs or desires in secret prayer before God, as material for the awakening, encouraging, admonishing of the flock to which you minister. Remember always that you are a teacher, that the teacher must first be taught, that God teaches by his Providence as well as by his word, that whatever God teaches you, you are to teach others, that whatever interests you, affects you, moves you, can be made a means of interesting, affecting, moving others. Open your eyes then to see the homiletical significance and importance of all your reading and of all your experience ; let all the currents of your life pour themselves into your preaching ; that preaching cannot be tame or powerless, which reflects and represents all the passions, hopes and endeavors of a live and true man, as he is moved upon by the countless influences of God's twofold revelation in nature and in the Bible.

So much with regard to the habit of taking in. One word now about the habit of giving out. I beg you to cultivate the demonstrative habit. Many ministers are as busy as bees in gathering, — but the product is shut up in a dark hive, — only the smallest portion of it is ever brought out to the light. There is a reticence, a shyness, a backwardness in the expression of ourselves, that constitutes a subtle foe to all ministerial success. This undemonstrativeness often excuses itself upon the ground of humility, — but it is false humility, in men who are set to be ambassadors of Jesus Christ, who have the word of the living God to preach, and to whom are promised all the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Freedom of utterance is, of course, to a large degree, the result of quick thought and ready sympathy, but it is also the cause of quick thought and ready sympathy. Here, as well as elsewhere, the more we give, the more we have. Learn then to be yourselves, to say out what is in you, with manliness of tone, with strength of voice, if need be. Let your whole nature, your whole experience, your whole life, in short, all there is of you, speak for Christ.

Only one habit more shall be mentioned — I mean the believing habit. As respects your brethren, cherish the spirit of confidence ; take them at their best ; trust them as men and as Christians. "Believing all things," says the apostle. Men will not believe in you, unless you believe in them. Some ministers carry about with them an atmosphere of criticism and of suspicion. They do not believe in *men*. And as a result they do not love them, nor hope for them. And, so long as you have no confidence in them, you can do them little good. How different the open, cheery, sympathetic, hopeful spirit that sees, in every Christian, a branch of the true vine, unfruitful for the time it may be, yet dear to Christ, and still capable of bringing forth abundant fruit. But better than the habit of believing in men is the habit of believing in God. I exhort you, in this day when the old landmarks of doctrine are so frequently obscured by the fogs of speculation, to believe in God. The preacher doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Believe not only, but glory in believing, — make it your business to believe, — be in this respect an example to

those you teach. As Peter and John fastened their eyes stedfastly upon the blind man, and the courage and faith of their hearts passed through their eyes, as it were, into him, so let the spectacle of your faith exert all around you a contagious influence, and lead men themselves to trust the healing Son of God.

I can give only a single sentence to the question how this cultivation of right habits is to be managed. It is to be managed by persistent putting forth of single imperative volitions, often against the tendency of our natural impulses and desires — volitions repeated continuously in dependence upon the help of the Spirit of God. And what I say with regard to the advantages of such cultivation I must condense almost as much. You know what nerve-centres are, and how physiologists tell us that by a sort of involuntary and automatic action these nerve-centres become lieutenants of the will and perform its behests even while we are apparently unconscious of their operation. I give the command to walk. There are nerve-centres that take the command from my will and execute it,— I go down the street, putting forth no further conscious volitions ; these subordinate powers do the work for me. The result is that my brain is left free for conversation with a friend, or for thought about my sermon. Every habit formed is in like manner a getting of the lower powers to do our work, with the result that the intellect and will are left free for other and higher concerns. Habits, therefore, economize our time and strength. The true pastor's maxim, "Never do anything yourself that you can get any one else to do for you," applies to his own faculties and powers. Conscious will should never do what it can get any of the lower powers to do for it. But it is more than economy,— it is safety also. Many a time, when selfish or indolent impulses would rule, they can be repressed by the simple thought that this is not our habit. The love of consistency saves us. Routine is itself a blessing. And these habits, if they are only habits of daily pondering God's work, of seeking its applications to human life, of uttering its truths to others, of trusting God and our brethren, will not only be the surest signs of a sanctified intellect and a self-sacrificing heart, but they will powerfully influence us to holiness and self-sacrifice, and so make the preacher a living example of the gospel which he preaches.

Be sure, my brethren, that what you *are* will influence your hearers more than what you *preach*. I look forward to earnest, persistent, unselfish, consecrated lives, to be lived and spent by this Class for Christ and for his church. God has been with you thus far, and he will guide you still. Though you may be widely separated, the memories of these three years of close companionship in sacred studies will be a refreshment and strength to you, and you will still be united to one another and to us by that one Spirit through whom we all have access to the Father. May God fill your places here by men as good and true, and raise up for the ministry a multitude as well prepared for their work ! We rejoice to-night that we have been able to do anything towards forming your intellectual and moral habits, in preparation for your sacred calling. Be faithful to what you have been taught,— better still, be faithful to the word of God, as the Spirit of God shall show you its meaning. You have been a pride and a comfort to us. Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers go with you. We expect, the churches expect, Christ expects, noble services from the class of eighteen hundred and eighty-four.

1885:

THE PREACHER'S DOUBTS.

Brethren of the Graduating Class :— This is an hour of contrasts, a time of sadness and of gladness, an ending and a beginning. We part from you regretfully, for you have been faithful students of God's truth ; hopefully, for you go to preach this truth to others. You have made your way to your present convictions through struggles ; you have gained for yourselves a firm assurance of the great truths of Christianity. You believe that the Scriptures are a special revelation from God, and that they represent God as triune, creating, redeeming and judging the world in Jesus Christ. You believe that man is fallen, congenitally depraved and wholly dependent for salvation upon the atoning sacrifice of Calvary and upon the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. You believe that out of the ruins of this fallen humanity God is building up a glorious church, which is to be his temple and dwelling-place forever, and that without connection with that great and invisible body, of which all earthly organizations are more or less perfect types and symbols, men abide in darkness and death.

But it is not about your beliefs — it is about your doubts, that I wish to speak to you. The preacher's doubts, and what he is to do with them — this is my theme. And the first thing I would say is, that Christianity gives place and room for doubt. Of course I do not mean that it is right to doubt God, — I do mean that it is often right to doubt what men say about him. Jesus did not doubt God, but he did doubt the interpretations of the Scribes and Pharisees. To doubt God's existence, or to doubt God's word when it is clearly set before us, is sin, but when man or Satan says God is so and so, or that his word means this or that, it may be a duty to doubt, and doubt may be the only road to truth. Though you have a fixed belief with regard to the main matters of theology, you well know that there are a thousand questions yet unanswered, and with regard to these you are free as the air to use your intellects and to interpret the Bible for yourselves. About many commonly received opinions you will have your doubts. Your doubts may be a sign of mental progress. You can make the truth effective, only by stripping off the cerements with which custom has bound it, and by bringing it forth in new life and power from its sepulchre.

But, secondly, remember that while Christianity leaves place and room for doubt, the incidents are not the essence of Christianity, and a thousand differences of belief about details will not affect the truth of the general scheme. Let us never imagine that, because we cannot explain certain apparent difficulties, the whole system may be a delusion. The astronomer does not give up gravitation, simply because the movements of certain satellites as yet refuse to be brought under its law. Men may worship securely in a great cathedral, although many a superficial stone of its exterior seems crumbling and falling from its place. So we are to believe that the foundation of God standeth sure, in spite of manifold perplexities with regard to the details of Christian truth.

Thirdly, even as respects these minor matters of the faith, remember that doubt is not refutation. You are not the first that have seen these difficulties.

There were brave men before Agamemnon. The Holy Spirit's enlightening influences have been given to others besides yourselves. When you begin to doubt accepted interpretations, therefore, do not take it for granted at once that your doubts are just. Carry your doubt a little further, and doubt yourselves — your perspicacity, the comprehensiveness of your thought, the completeness of your induction of facts. Take advice — not the advice of doubters like yourselves only, but the advice of men who have worried through with their doubts, and who at least think they have got out of the quagmire upon solid ground. Read books — not the books of the enemies of Christ and his gospel exclusively, for you may so saturate yourselves with plausible unbelief, as utterly to unfit yourselves for sober, independent judgment, — but the books of the great Christian thinkers, the Butlers, the Pascals, and in modern days the Dorners and the Smiths, of the church. Above all, live in the self-evidencing sunlight of the Scriptures ; make the word of God the man of your counsel ; ten to one, if you will permit it to do so, the Bible will explain itself.

Fourthly, do not preach new doctrine till you have some new doctrine to preach. In other words, do not publish your doubts, — wait till they become certainties. There is no foe to truth so dangerous as haste, for haste has self-will and presumption for fellow-laborers. The Holy Spirit was promised to guide the apostles into all the truth, but we know that he did not do this by some sudden flash of lightning, but rather by a continuous enlightenment as to doctrine and polity, which was not completed until the last apostle died. And so the Holy Spirit will guide us into all the truth — but not necessarily in three months. Preach no tentative sermons, then, to see how a certain new conception of yours will work, — you have no business to try the *materia medica* of the gospel upon your patients in any such fashion. Keep your doubts to yourself, until you have solved them and do not need to preach them, or until you have found truth and verified it by long thought and observation, and can preach it as the very truth of God.

Fifthly, and finally, work and pray the more, the more you doubt. You cannot reach truth in this universe of God without the help of Christ, who is the truth. And he will give you his help in finding the truth, only as you obey him. Shall a man who doubts, shut himself out from preaching and from visiting the sick, on the plea that he must be wholly independent, and must give all his time to investigation? Remember that religious truth is a matter of the heart, as much as it is a matter of the intellect ; that the cold heart cannot judge of it ; that only sympathy for sinning and suffering men can prove that we love God ; that without love to God we cannot know God, or know the truth of God. The more you doubt, then, throw yourselves the more vigorously and devoutly into all manner of Christian service. He who does Christ's will shall know of his teaching, whether it be from God. The more you doubt, pray the more. For doubts will disappear when the obedient servant lays them at the Master's feet ; even on earth his presence will give us the best light for our darkness ; and, when at last the day dawns and the shadows flee away, it will be heaven itself to hear his word : "O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"

You are stewards of the mysteries of God, sent upon a great commission, entrusted with the truth that is to save mankind. You go out into an unbe-

lieving age — an age that is weary and hopeless in its unbelief, and that longs for nothing so much as the man that can bring positive truth from God, answers to the great problems of existence, practical salvation from its sorrow and sin. You can win, you can stand, in this age, only by believing. In more senses than one, the just nowadays shall live by his faith. That faith will be assailed, assailed more subtly and more powerfully than in any age before. Doubts will come to you — doubts that will shake you. You may treat them in two ways. You may treat them, on the one hand, as Othello treated his doubts of Desdemona. You may listen only to Iago; you may cast away all you have known in the past of Desdemona's truth and faithfulness, as so much credulity and superstition; you may condemn her on the unsupported testimony of her worst enemy; you may ruthlessly slay her you love best. So you may condemn Christ and his gospel on the word of his foes; you may turn doubt into apostasy; you may crucify the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame. But there is another way to treat doubts. It is the way of doubting Thomas. He stayed away for a little from the assembly of Christ's disciples, but he came back; he said he would not be convinced unless he put his hand in the prints of the nails, but when Christ appeared to him he needed no such proof; he loved the Savior after all, and no disciple of them all left us so majestic a confession of faith as did this same doubting Thomas, when he bowed at Christ's feet and cried: "My Lord and my God."

My brethren, I do not pray for you that God will keep you from all doubt, but I do pray that through all doubt he may lead you into his truth. It is not doubt, but faith, that constitutes God's measure of a man. Romaine, in his diary, speaks of "a year famous for believing." I pray not that one year of your lives, but that every year of your lives may be a year famous for believing; for be sure that "this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

1886:

HIGH-MINDEDNESS.

Brethren of the Graduating Class:— You have now accomplished your course of preparatory study. Full of hope and vigor, you are anticipating the public duties of the ministry. I trust that the Seminary has done something to fit you for them. You have learned to work here — to work from an inner impulse, and not because you were driven. You have gained some new knowledge of the great system of truth which you are to commend to your fellow-men. Above all, you have become more manly and more sympathetic,— you are broader and truer men than when you came to us three years ago. Your instructors have seen growth in you, and it is with hope and cheer that we look forward to your service for Christ. Much of this hope is based upon our conviction that you are high-minded men, and and that this high-mindedness is of a Christian sort. It is with regard to this that I would speak to you. There is a high-mindedness that is good; there is a high-mindedness that is evil. I would have you cultivate the one; I would have you abhor and renounce the other.

Let me give you something in the way of definition. A proper high-mindedness is that which sets the human mind above things naturally inferior to it, and which at the same time bids this human mind look upward to a higher mind and strengthen itself by the reception of what is freely offered us by God. A false and unworthy high-mindedness is that which disregards the mind's appointed and secondary place, and seeks to set itself above confession of sin, above dependence upon Christ, above faith in his word, above obedience to his law. We love a truly high-minded man — a man who regards the soul as of greater importance than the body, and who, therefore, can sacrifice physical comfort and endure hardness for the sake of intellectual or moral or religious good; a man who regards the great things of the soul as of more value than the little things, and who, therefore, can care less about petty slights, and personal ambitions, and intellectual achievements, than he does about the state of his heart before God and the eternal welfare of his fellow-men; a man who regards God's mind as greater than his own mind, and therefore accepts trustfully every word of God, whether he fully understands it or not; a man who regards God's will as the supreme will, and who, therefore, submits himself unreservedly to the allotments of God's Providence; a man who regards God's strength as the only strength, and who, therefore, claims no righteousness and hopes for no salvation except those which come to him through the atonement of Christ and the sanctifying influences of his Spirit.

Here is a high-mindedness that is worthy of praise, for it seeks the things that are above, where Christ is, seated at God's right hand. Such high-mindedness as this is humble, believing, submissive, while yet it stands for God, and defies an embattled world. This was the high-mindedness of the Reformers, who feared God so much that they had no other fear; this is the high-mindedness of every minister of Christ who, in the strength of Christ, preaches his gospel as the only salvation of the world.

But there is another sort of high-mindedness which makes self the centre and standard, rather than God, and that self not the true self, but the lower and false self. Such high-mindedness esteems one's own physical comfort as more worthy of consideration than intellectual or moral progress, either in one's self or in others, and the men who carry this spirit into the ministry feed themselves, rather than the flock of God. He would be a poor soldier who should refuse to obey the order of his superior, because obedience might endanger his life. The chief value of life to a Christian soldier is that he may hazard it for Christ. A false high-mindedness overvalues the merely intellectual in comparison with the moral and spiritual, — in other words, it sets mind above heart. Petty errors of pronunciation, or spelling, or grammar, are more regarded than weight of argument, beauty of character, or the services of a life-time, and for the unity of a specious scheme of thought men sacrifice both history and ethics. This sort of high-mindedness constantly tends to over-esteem of one's own opinion. Toleration and love for opponents, reverence for the great thinkers of the church, consciousness of dependence upon the Bible and upon God — these fade out from the mind, and the soul is left bare and desolate as a garden when the autumn frosts have come. High-mindedness of this sort is rationalistic in spirit, but it is also a denial of the doctrines of grace. The man who does not feel the need

of God and God's revelation in his intellectual life, will not long feel his need of God and God's revelation in his moral life. He will come to believe in his own merits, and will deny the atonement of Christ, the regeneration of the Spirit, and the justification of the Father. Well for him if he does not go further, and set his own will above God's will, utterly breaking away from the restraints of God's law, as well as from the grace of his gospel.

The minister of Christ is peculiarly exposed to these dangers, and for this reason perhaps, among others, the word "high-minded" is never used in the New Testament in a favorable, but always in an unfavorable, sense. "Be not high-minded, but fear," says the apostle. I do not know any exhortation more needful to a class of young men just entering upon the work of the preacher and pastor. You are to be looked up to as persons of a higher education than the mass of your hearers; you are to be esteemed as better men than the mass, by reason of the very sacredness of your calling. If you have any tendency to be puffed up in your own esteem, the comparative isolation of your position will give abundant opportunity for increasing this tendency, and we unfortunately see in the ministry an occasional instance of an opinionated and self-willed man, who is very contemptuous of others, and whose whole aim seems to be to lord it over God's heritage. There are some natural checks upon this disposition, such as the total absence of ranks in the ministry, the fact that many a plain church-member knows more of his Bible and has more common sense in practical matters than his minister does, and the certainty that the proud spirit will meet with a fall. God usually takes care that the supercilious young minister is in various ways knocked on the head until the superciliousness is knocked out of him.

But how can we save ourselves this heroic treatment? God prefers to treat us more mildly, and will do so if we will permit him. I know of no way to escape, but by cultivating humility from the very start. And this we can do, to some degree, by considering its fundamental place among the Christian virtues. "What is the first grace of the Christian character?" was the question put to Augustine. And the answer was: "Humility." "And what the second?" He answered as before: "Humility." "And what is the third?" Still Augustine replied: "Humility." And he was right. Humility is the first, second, and third, of the virtues, because without it we cannot receive any other grace whatever from God. Humility is docile and receptive. But high-mindedness is arrogant, exclusive, unteachable, and shuts the door both to truth and to duty.

But we have a better incentive than any which the mere consideration of consequences could supply. It is found in the example of our blessed Lord. He who was highest took the lowest place. Divine Wisdom at the beginning of his earthly life consented to be taught of man, and divine Power at the end of his earthly life limited itself until it could endure the sufferings of the cross. Have we ever really considered what was the meaning of that cross? There in a few brief hours, and in a little spot of earth, were revealed the self-affirming purity of God, and yet the self-sacrificing love of God — a purity and a love which in themselves transcend all space and all time. Imagine for a moment that a cross could be erected that stretched from this earth to the most distant of the stars of space. Imagine a Being stretched upon that cross whose greatness surpassed that of all the visible universe.

Imagine an agony that lasted for longer periods than our minds can grasp — sighs of immeasurable duration, and drops of blood that took ages upon ages to fall. To some minds this would more fitly represent a divine suffering, than does the transaction on Calvary. But remember that such an atonement as this, though objectively it might be of infinite value, would yet be subjectively valueless for beings so limited as ourselves. We could not take it in,— we should be only stupefied and bewildered at the contemplation. Therefore divinity has contracted itself into the limits of our humanity. God has brought himself within the narrow bounds of a human body and a human life. The atonement has been wrought in such a way that we can grasp it and be affected by it. Yet it is just as great in essence, as if the whole material universe were a cross, and all time were the duration of the Savior's suffering. For Christ is "the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world," and the cross is a revelation in time of eternal facts in the nature of God — God's hatred of sin, and yet God's compassion for the sinner.

Denunciations of pride will never help us to humility,— but the contemplation of the cross will. There we see the dreadfulness of sin,— for it brought death to the Son of God. But there also we see our sin judged and condemned forever, so that now there is "no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

> "When I survey the wondrous cross
> On which the Prince of Glory died,
> My richest gain I count but loss,
> And pour contempt on all my pride."

In view of what He did, who "being rich, for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be made rich," we can give up all for his sake, can take the lowest place, can do the humblest work, to fullfil the purpose of his sacrifice, and to save the souls for whom he died. As you go out then into the active work of the ministry, my brethren, my last counsel to you is simply that of the Apostle Paul: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross."

1887:

ZEAL FOR CHRIST.

BRETHREN OF THE GRADUATING CLASS:— You have spent three years with us in preparation for the ministry. Your instructors testify that you have been faithful in your work. We send you out with our blessing. We cherish high hopes for you. May he who has counted you worthy, putting you into the ministry, grant you a long, and happy, and successful career, in preaching the gospel and in winning men to Christ.

When I pray that your lives may be long, neither you nor I can forget

that one who began work with you is not here to-night. Neville graduated before you. He knows more theology now than we all. Somewhere, I doubt not, he is performing nobler service than he could have rendered here. His love of truth, his decision of character, his sweetness of spirit — these remain in our memory. Though dead, he yet speaks to us — urges us not to mourn, not to idle, but to close up the ranks and march on.

The one word which I would give you as your watchword to-night is the word "zeal." It is a lofty word, and our Lord consecrated it when he said that the zeal of God's house had consumed him. And yet the word to many minds, in this age of easy-going indifferentism, has an ill sound. Let me clear it from misconception, by saying that zeal is not necessarily fanaticism. It is zeal for Christ, to which I entreat you. That zeal has none of the attributes of fanaticism: it is neither narrow, nor overwrought, nor hard. Fanaticism is narrow; it sees only a small portion of the field; it makes only a partial induction of facts. Zeal for Christ cannot make this mistake, for it has for its object Him who is not only the truth, but the whole truth of God. Fanaticism is overwrought; it is an exaggerated and extravagant enthusiasm; it throws into a single line the mental power and emotion that were meant to be expended upon the whole realm of duty. Zeal for Christ, on the other hand, can never be overwrought; for love can never love too much when it loves him; all human effort is too weak when matched with his infinite claims; strive as we may, we never can do enough to secure this highest of all ends — the triumph of Christ and his truth in the world. Fanaticism is hard; the sensibility and devotion which it pours out upon one limited part of God's creation it withdraws from all the rest; the Spanish Inquisition and the French Revolution show that an uninstructed conscience may become merciless, and may clothe the executioners of justice in hell-fire. Zeal for Christ, on the contrary, as it proclaims, so it is bound to manifest, the sympathy and love of God; is bound to distinguish between the sinner and his sin; is bound to have compassion upon all that are in error, that it may enlighten them and save them.

I do not mean to say that any zeal among men is absolutely pure,— that would be to claim that sinless perfection has been reached; and, alas, the imperfection of our views and the fact that our motives are mixed show that no such perfect state is ours. But we know that there was once an example of fiery, and yet sinless, zeal. We know that the pure flame of Christ's zeal has been to some degree enkindled in us. What I urge is, that our zeal for Christ may reflect and emulate Christ's zeal for God. Think what its characteristics were. First, there was an absolute faith. One word of God was of more account to Jesus, than all the words of angels or demons or men. My brethren, I would have you trust Christ and his truth, more than you trust all the world beside. Whatever philosophy may say, whatever oppositions of science falsely so-called may arise, whatever habit of skepticism may have become part of the mental structure of our generation, let us admit no doubts, listen to no parleyings, but rather set to our seal that God is true, though every man be thereby made a liar.

And then, secondly, Christ's zeal was distinguished, not only by an absolute faith, but by a passionate devotion. I urge you to give yourselves to the service of Christ, with the singleness of purpose and the total self-abandon-

ment with which Christ gave himself to God. I do not need to tell you that Christ is God. You believe this. I would have you act upon it. Shall I give you a motto? Take this: *Christo Deo Omnipotenti.* Mean by it that to Christ, the omnipotent God, you consecrate yourself utterly, making no reserve, but giving to him all your powers in the utmost intensity of their exercise. O, it is no more than Paul has said before me! I might have taken this motto instead of mine: *Mihi Vivere Christus*—"for me to live is Christ."

I have urged you to imitate and reflect Christ's zeal — that pure flame of absolute faith and passionate devotion. A vast and impossible achievement, do you say? An ideal never to be reduced to practice by any mortal man? True, if it came to us merely as law, and not as gospel; merely as command, and not as promise. I thank God that there is an easier way to fulfil the injunction and secure the blessing — an easier way than the hopeless way of self-moved and self-sustained obedience. It is by taking Christ himself into our hearts. His zeal can become ours, only when he himself becomes ours. But then, he can become ours, and like Paul, "we can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth us." Way of the simple! Wisdom of the meek! We have learned something of it in the past. May we resolve anew to-night that we will have no other wisdom and know no other way, but will "count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ!"

My dear brethren, it is with a heart of love and hope that I look into your faces for the last moments of our relation as teacher and pupils. What I have said to you is the greatest thing and the best thing I could possibly say. No archangel could give you a message whose substance should be grander, more momentous, more stirring than this; for this Christ in whom I have urged you to put absolute faith, and to whom I have urged you to show passionate devotion — this Christ is all and in all. There are two problems which lie before you for solution — the internal and the external, — and only Christ can help you to solve them. There is the problem of your own heart, your own personal sin, your own advancement in holiness, in short, your own spiritual life. Unless you can overcome sin within you, you can never overcome sin in the world without. But you can overcome sin within you, if you have Christ and his zeal. Why does not the ocean come up into the river channel and flood the river banks? Because the steady outward current drives the ocean waves before it, and takes its tides of fresh water far out to sea. How shall you prevent sin from overwhelming you and destroying you? By having so much of Christ's life within, that you are ever making aggressive movement against the evil, and so thrusting its forces from you. Zeal for Christ will leave no room or chance for the inflowing of temptation.

And then there is the external problem,— we must conquer the world without. There is sin to be convicted, and sorrow to be assuaged, the church to be comforted, the earth to be subdued, the kingdom to be given to Christ — a task as mighty, for hands as feeble, as ever the hands of Christ's disciples were in the first days of the church. And yet they "overcame through the blood of the Lamb," and so may we. Christ made them partakers of his zeal, and so made them "more than conquerors."

May his Holy Spirit communicate to you this zeal, and keep the fire of

love and loyalty ever burning within you. Lay yourselves out for Christ; bury yourselves in his work; merge your interests in his; speak, live, only for him. Before you, the mountain shall become a plain. At your word, dead souls shall live. Millennial light shall begin to dawn about you. The kingdom of God shall come. It will make little difference whether your eyes see it or not, if only with your dying breath you can say: "The zeal of thine house hath consumed me." For there is another zeal than yours — a zeal that can accomplish what you cannot. Of all the other work that is needed to supplement our own and to make it effective, we can confidingly and exultingly declare that "the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this." For all our zeal, like the zeal of our Savior, is but an effect and manifestation of that infinite zeal of the divine nature, which is fulfilling in human history the eternal decree that Christ must reign until all enemies are put beneath his feet.

INDEX

INDEX.

Abgarus, on the picture of Christ said to have been presented to, 203
Ability, present, not ground of sinner's accountability, 102
Ability, gracious, consequences of regarding it as ground of sinner's guilt, 102
"Absolute," Mr. Spencer's idea of chimerical, 51
in what sense God is, 51, 74
Accountability, not measured by present ability, 102
Accumulation of property, robbery according to Socialism, 452
dangers of, according to some, 452
Socialistic proposals of its limitation, 453
the intellectual and moral prerequisite of, 462
Mill's suggested legal limitations, 462
has its economical limitations, 462, 463
has its Christian limitations, 463, 464
must be subservient to the principles of religion and benevolence, 463, 464
Achromatic lenses, illustration from the construction of, 445
Adam, how did he sin though possessed of a holy disposition? 108
difficulty of explaining his fall, 108, 109
had the power of contrary choice, 108
chose according to motive, 109
whence the motive of his choice? 109
his being deceived presupposes unbelief, 109
the theory that he received assisting not supernatural grace, 109
his apostasy first internal, 110
his apostasy changed the nature, 110
his first differed from his subsequent sins, 110
his fall cannot be explained on any present theory of will, 108, 110
his sin, why imputed to us, 224
Adams, Charles F., his educational reforms, 426
ADAPTATION, 569-572
Adaptation, ministerial, its nature, 570
its sources, 570, 571
its results, 571, 572
ADDRESSES TO SUCCESSIVE GRADUATING CLASSES, 544-586
"Adequate" cause distinguished from "efficient," 92
Adultery, its punishment under Mosaic law, 437
annuls as effectively as death the marriage relation, 438
opinions of Roman church regarding, 438
sole valid ground of divorce, 438
its theocratic penalty among Jews during Roman domination, 438
the action of Christ in relation to, 438, 439
ought to be subject of severe legislation, 439
Æsop, one of his fables referred to, 455
Africa, progress of discovery in, illustrative of researches into man's nature, 96, 97
Afrite, and king's daughter, illustration from, 243
Age, present, one of dogmatism, 557
its skeptical aspect, 558, 559
Aiát of Koran, 146
Albans, Saint, fable of, 146
Alchemy, its punishment according to Dante, 512
Alexander, Dr. J. W., on Union with Christ, 220
Alfred, King, on man's goodness, 115
Allegheny and Monongahela, their junction a type of man's nature, 190
Alps, melting of snow on, an illustration from, 5
Al-raschid, see Raschid,
Alumni, of Rochester Theological Seminary, address to, 1-18
meeting of, sentiments suitable to, 1, 2
Amphion, the preacher an, 276
Amsterdam, its pile-foundations alluded to, 3
Anagogical interpretation, what? 505
Anaximander, his one postulate, 40
Ancestral experiences, their fundamental value according to Spencer, 49, 50
according to Spencer, the origin of moral obligation, 53
Andaman Islanders, their supposed atheism considered, 78
Angelo, Michael, his fresco of last judgment, 208
his universal genius, 550
Anselm, on development in Genesis, 45
"Antecedence," not equivalent to "causation," 33

Anthropological, or moral, argument for the existence of God, 83
its three parts, 83, 84
its defects, 84
its value, 84
holds chief place among related arguments, 84
Apollo, proposed interpretation of double legend upon his temple at Delphi, 4
Apologia Pro Vita Sua, contains a confession of Idealism, 7
A posteriori arguments for the existence of God, their value, 84, 85
Apostles, their qualifications included both teaching of Christ and principally the induement of the Spirit, 550
A priori argument for divine existence, see Ontological.
A priori reasoning, Tait on, 40, 41
A priori principles assumed in all systems of knowledge, 41
A priori reasoning, its vicious use by Spencer and the Cosmic philosophers, 41
A priori truths, at the foundation of knowledge, 48
part of the original furniture of reason, 48
sense, the occasion of their cognition, 48
according to Plato, 48
presupposed in all experience and reasoning, 48
their denial destroys all philosophy and opens way for universal skepticism, 48, 49
denied by extreme Positivists, 49
Spencer's explanation of their genesis, 49
Spencer assumes their existence to destroy their validity. 49
Spencer's treatment of them unsatisfactory, 49, 50
Dr. Carpenter on, 50
A priori judgments, Kant on, 60, 61
Aquosity, a property of water, 34
Arab horse, his characteristics, 475
Arabian Nights, illustrations from, mountain of loadstone, 10
Afrite and king's daughter, 243
enfranchised genie, 463
Architecture, mediæval, its origin, 500
Aristotle, his influence on theology, 4
Luther's opinion of, 4
the parent of scholasticism, 4
a theistic philosopher, 15
on an evil law in our members, 101
Arminian view of original depravity arises from false view of will 101, 102
Arthur, Chester A., varied feelings on his attainment of the Presidency, 355, 356
Arthur, Chester A., an excellent opportunity for reform afforded him, 356, 35
Artisans, despised by ancient philosophers, 447, 448
Arve and Rhone, their junction a symbol of man's moral nature, 190
Assassination of two Presidents, summons the nation to a considerate standing-still, 347
Association, the force of law of, illustrated in Crusades, 484
Associationalism, as an explanation of the existence of moral obligation, considered, 54
ASSUMPTIONS, UNCONSCIOUS, OF COMMUNION POLEMICS, 245–249
Assumption, that the practice of the church may modify law of New Testament, considered, 245, 246
that there is no complete and binding system of church organization in the New Testament, considered, 246, 247
that the ordinances are purely formal and external, considered, 247, 248
that the principle of *laissez faire* will remove error and secure peace and prosperity, considered, 248
Astronomy, why its birth-place in the East, 473
Atheism, sporadic cases of, not inconsistent with a universal germinal knowledge of the existence of God, 78
Atom of matter, what, according to Humist, 59
Atomic weights, an inference from, 6
Atoms, "manufactured articles", 44
ATONEMENT, NECESSITY OF, 213–219
Atonement, sufferings of, demanded by righteousness of God, 213
demanded by the relations which Christ assumed to our race, 213–218
required by Christ's race-responsibility to the law of God, 213–215
willingly rendered by Christ because of his regard to the vindication of divine righteousness, 215–216
inevitable because of Christ's complete identification with a sinful race, 216, 217
only to be satisfactorily explained by the doctrine of Christ's actual union with our race, 218, 219
the first desire of the awakened conscience, 219
Attila, Kaulbach's picture of his battle with the Romans, 17
Attributes, divine, their relation to the essence of God, 189
have an objective existence, 189
defined, 189
have an active and passive side, 189
Auerbach, his stories tinged with materialism, 31

Augustine and Calvin, their respective methods of treating divine truths, 4
Augustine, a Platonist, 4
perceived the principle of development in the Mosaic account of creation, 45
his view of human liberty, 114
on adding to Original Sin through Free Will, 121
opposes pilgrimages, 485
on humility, 582
Aurora Borealis, bad light to grow potatoes by, 570
Australian savages, condition of women among, 411
Automatic theory of universe, 27
Goldwin Smith on, 27, 28
its conclusion of despair in the words of Tennyson, 28
Avatar, a temporary incarnation, 209
Averages, statistical, Buckle's and Draper's inferences from, 23
the legitimate inference from, 24
James Martineau on, 24
Bacon, Roger, not Francis, author of the Baconian philosophy, 40
Baconian philosophy, its origin, 40
its method, 40
a recoil from Greek and Scholastic philosophies, 40
its fundamental organon violated by philosophy of evolution, 40
Bagehot, on a statue to the first sower, 462
Bain, Alexander, a Positivist, 8
his materialism, 31
on thinking co-existing with unbroken physical sequences, 46
a Humist, 59
Bancroft on the practical influence of the speculations of Jonathan Edwards, 5
Baptism, a usual metaphor to express the rush of successive troubles, 229
a significant symbol, 239
imports purification through death, 239
a picture of the substance of Christianity, 240
associated with Lord's Supper, 240, 241
anything which affects its form as a symbol affects truth symbolized, 240
and Supper are as the twins of Hippocrates, 240
Baptism of Jesus, 226–237
Baptism of Jesus, throws light on that of the believer, 226
its place in his life, 226, 227
a self-consecration, 227
a symbol of his death, 227
a proof of his identification with humanity, 230
foreshadowed his resurrection, 231
the occasion of a manifestation of the Trinity, 232
Baptism of Jesus, the descent of the Spirit at, what it implied, 232
exhibited the desert of sin, 232, 233
exhibited a picture of deliverance, 233
exhibited the method of personal salvation, 234
is an example of public confession, 235
Baptists, have truth of Baptism committed to their custody, 241
are bound to be faithful to their trust, 242
believe that an adequate model of church organization is found in New Testament, 246
why they hold to Baptism, 247
why they contend for the order of the ordinances, 247
have increased because of faithfulness to convictions, 248
how they may expect future growth, 248
purity their primary concern, not peace, 249
theirs, the only regularly constituted church, 249
Baptists, German, their origin and progress, 243
their need of theological schools, 300
Barrett, Elizabeth, her marriage to Browning, 526
her death, 526
Bastian, his theory of spontaneous generation, 46
Bastiat, his contribution to Political Science, 448
on relation of Political Economy and Morals, 458
Bestiality, sin of, according to Dante, 511, 512
Beatitudes, absence of warlike virtues from, 415
Beatrice, Portinari, her influence upon Dante, 502, 503
her early death, 502
the Divine Comedy, her monument, 503
Dante's guide through Paradise, 505, 519
what she represents in the Divine Comedy, 507
the culmination of her loveliness and of Dante's love for, in highest heaven. 520
Beauty, knowledge and feeling combined in its cognition, 124
Bedouin robbers, 477
skirmish with, 480
Bee, its unconscious intelligence, 26
Beecher, H.W., on Eternal Punishment, 196
"Being, Great," title under which Comte proposed to worship "Collective Humanity", 13
Belief in God, necessary to morals, 56
a remarkable fact, 76
Beliefs, primitive, an original endowment of mind, 9, 10
come into activity on occasion of external phenomena, 10

Beliefs, primitive, are objects of knowledge, 10
have validity equal to facts of sense, 10
Beliefs, may be held though unexpressed, unformulated, or even formally denied, 76
may be undeveloped, 77
Berkeley, Bishop, sought to correct the materialistic tendencies of the Lockian philosophy, 58
asserted the only evidence of matter to be idea, 58
asserted that sensations were the direct objects of knowledge, 58
declared God to be the direct cause of sensations, 58
his theory consistent with belief in special divine revelation 59
his fundamental principle only further applied by Hume, 59
held to spirit because directly known by ourselves, 59
his occasional approaches to Humism, 59
his definition of soul, 59
his definition of mind, 59
responsible for our present Materialistic Idealism, 59
Sydney Smith's witticism upon, 59
declares things are thoughts, 61
a non-egoistical idealist, 62
his early confusion concerning idea as object and act, 63
his later conception of idea as object, an archetype in the divine mind, 63
the outer world was to him real and permanent because an expression of the divine mind, 63
to him, the *non-ego* is God, 63
his theory has a radical affinity with Realism, 63
his theory according to Sir William Hamilton, 63, 64
did not regard divine archetypes as "things in themselves," 72
his method of securing unity in external world, 166
influenced Jonathan Edwards, 168
Berkeleian Idealism, its influence on John H. Newman 7
Bethlehem visited, 481
Bethune on Political Economy as next to the Gospel, 443
Bewusstsein—a "be-knowing", 80
Beyrout, description of, 474
Bible, "word made flesh," 153
to be interpreted as an organic whole, 154
its frequent presentations of mercy and justice combined, 391
some of its requirements temporary, 402
its principles still applicable to these days, 408
Bicarbonate of soda, a child's questions concerning, 425, 426
Biology, a branch of physiology according to Positivism, 13
"Blameless," as applied to New Testament bishop, its meaning, 440, 441
Blasphemy, its future punishment according to Dante, 512
"Body," as apprehended by the intelligence of the common people, 67
Boscovitch, his conception of matter, 43
Bowne, a Hegelian, 61
Bramante, architect of St. Peter's at Rome, 242
Brassey, advocates the coöperative system of employment, 457
Braun, the two principal books studied in his Gymnasium, 423
Brethren, Plymouth, their view of church-organizations, 246
Briggs's Colliery, on the coöperative plan, 455
Brown, Tom, his return to Rugby referred to, 1
Brown, Sir Thomas, on futility of seeking preservation beneath the moon, 473
Browning, Robert, "subtlest assertor of the soul in song," 36
his statement, "mind is not matter, nor from matter, but above," 36
"POETRY AND" 525-543
his portrait by Watts, 526
a sketch of his life, 526
his acquaintance with Italy, 526
marries Elizabeth Barrett, 526
loses his wife, 526
a prolific writer, 526
Pauline, his first printed poem, 526
Paracelsus, his first tragedy, 526
the tragedy of *Strafford* a failure on the stage, 526
never popular, 526
severely criticized, 526
is he a great poet? 526
hides his own personality, 527
deals with the *non-ego*, 527
a poet of man, 528
contrasted with Wordsworth, 528
treats of life, 528
poet of thoughts and not events, 528
his little tinge of the objective or epic, 528
teaches that "as a man thinketh so he is," 528
his poetry is not lyric, but dramatic, 528, 529
his dramatic power seen in the poems *Spanish Cloister* and *Confessions*, 529
he assists his reader to self-revelation, 529
is a creative genius, 529
The Ring and the Book his greatest work, 529, 531
its plot narrated, 530
the impression it leaves on the mind of the student, 530, 531

Browning, Robert, to what extent does he possess the faculty of idealization, discussed, 531-536
to him all men are ideal things, 532
recognizes human conscience, and will, 533
in his *Ixion* the victim triumphs over Jove, 533
in his *Pippa Passes* the peasant girl's song awakens conscience, 533
a believer in a righteous and loving personal God, 534
opposes anthropomorphism, 534
in his *Caliban on Setebos* denounces superstition, 534
in the *Epilogue* declares his faith in an immanent Deity, 534
in *Saul* declares "all's Love yet all's Law," 534
makes Incarnation the highest revelation, 534
the religious topics of which he treats in "*Ferishtah's Fancies*," 534
has a true idea of inspiration, 534, 535
his poem of *Saul* the best for those who are beginning to study him, 534
the poem *Saul*, its subject, 535
his teaching in his *Death in the Desert*, 535
he, rather than Tennyson, is the religious poet of the century, 535
the religious philosopher of our times, 535
Landor's estimate of, 535, 536
indulges at times in apparent levity, 536
sometimes apparently irreverent, 536
the motto he adopts for *Ferishtah's Fancies*, 536
treats freely of man's physical instincts, 536
is never ascetic, 536
never deifies body, 536
has not a tinge of sentimentality, 536, 537
has a protecting sense of the ludicrous, 537
in *Dis Aliter Visum* teaches that true love is subject to judgment and conscience, 537
his books exercise a healthful, bracing influence 537
least great as a literary artist, 537
is often obscure, 538
the arrangement of his material often perplexing, 538
Sordello often regarded as a mediæval literary morass, 538
his defense of his fragmentary method of communicating his facts, 538
he makes his reader a judge, poet, creator, 539
his method of telling his story illustrated in *The Ring and the Book*, 539
Browning, Robert, his obscurity becomes less troublesome and more attractive on familiarity, 539
there are passages which perhaps the poet cannot understand, 539
his translation of Agamemnon facetiously said to be comprehensible by reference to the original, 539, 540
exhibits occasional lack of judgment as to what is valuable and what merely curious, 540
influence of criticism of Caroline Fox upon, 540
is often defective in constructive power to make most of his matter, 540
examples of his obscure and of his easily intelligible verse, 540
fails in rhythmical and musical expression, 541
Mrs. Browning superior to him in melodious composition 541
aims not to be an emotional poet, 541
his brusque style accounted for, 541
a poem illustrating his abrupt turns, 541
plays a sort of literary "Snap the Whip" with his readers, 51, 542
in him the philosopher overtops the poet, 542
his material too much for him, 542
gives us sometimes too little ortolan, 542
cannot treat him with superciliousness, 542
his defects should not blind to his virtues, 543
the fullest of learning and insight of the poets of the century, 543
Büchner, a mechanical philosopher, 31
a modern Lucretius, 39
Buckland, Rabbi Joseph Wales, his parentage and early life, 337, 338
his name "Rabbi," why given and its influence, 338
his mother, 338
his conversion, 338
enters Union College, New York, 338
his taste for natural science, 338, 339
Dr. W. R. Williams's influence upon him, 339
becomes pastor at Sing Sing, 339
becomes member of Historical Society of New York, 339
becomes Professor of History at Rochester, 339
his professional life, 339-342
his death, 342
his work not yet done, 342, 343
Buckle, Henry Thomas, his statistical averages, 23
the materialistic spirit of his historical researches, 31
Buddhism, its missionary character accounted for, 388
the nature of its morality, 388

Bunker Hill, Battle of, referred to, 269
Bunyan, his "man with the muck-rake" alluded to, 8
Burning of one's hand, facts physical and metaphysical involved in, 21
Burke, his oratory characterized by Fox, vii
Bushnell, Horace, a progenitor of the New Theology, 165
identifies divine righteousness and benevolence, 165
his theory of atonement contains a truth, 165
Business, daily, a trusteeship for Christ, 463
Butler, Bishop Joseph, how he has contributed to our conception of the ethical nature of God, 5, 195
did not sufficiently recognize divine immanence, 167
Byron, Lord, a quotation from applied to Positivist's universe, 13
his genius, 527
Cæsarea, its ruins, 477
Caird, a Hegelian, 61
Cairo, 470, 471
night entrance into, 474
Calderwood, denies the possibility of an act of pure will, 92, 122
Call to ministry, its dignity, 270
not universal, 270, 271
commoner than supposed, 271
its nature, 271, 272
Calling, a useful, always respectable 449
Calvin and Augustine, their works compared, 4
Calvin, his assertion of free-will, 91
his theory of human liberty compared with that of Edwards, 114
on Adam's free-will, 121
asserted divine immanence, 167
Calvinism, Modified, 114–128
Campaniles, their erection and uses, 499
Campbell's theory of Atonement, 216
"Cannot" often equal to "will not," 124
Capital, moneyed, of America, its ratio to the annual production, 447
Capital, dreaded by laborer, 452
may secure a tyrannical monopoly of production, 452
wrong thinking about it even in America, 452
what it is, 453
deserves compensation, 453
its compulsory distribution a foolish scheme, 453
must be consumed in paying wages, 453
must be renewed by labor, 454
not the natural end of labor, 454
has duties, 455
its increase should not be dreaded, 456
acquires dignity from its origin, 462
acquires dignity from use, 462
is a large set of tools, 462
Capital, a fund that employs labor, 462
a friend of labor, 462, 464
to exist must be in constant circulation, 462
without it barbarism would supervene, 462
Capital and labor, relations between, should be intelligently discussed, 452
are interdependent, 452
should be no hostility between, 455
both have duties, 455
coöperation of both, illustrations of, 455
their relations will yet be settled on a lasting basis, 457
Carlyle, Thomas, on Dante, 523
his portrait by Watts, 525
Carpenter, Dr., on one's existence being a matter of consciousness, 50
Cataclysms in geologic history, 141
Cataract, parable of man afflicted with, 89
Cato of Utica, his place in future world according to Dante, 515
Causal judgment, into what resolved by Comte, 11
Causality, Hickok's illustration of, 10
Causation, necessary to law, 11
if its intuition is disproved all other intuitions also perish, 11
origin of the idea of, 22
not given by mere succession of events, 22
Cause, according to Comte, 10
defined, 33
more than antecedence, 33
an *a priori* truth, 48
of the universe, every religion demands personality in, 53
Causes final, secure confidence in the stability of nature, 141
account for needed deviations from usual order, 141
Causes, the various philosophical, 92
efficient rest on final, 141
Cecil, on how to preach the whole truth, 115
Ceremonial privilege requires ceremonial qualification, 247
Certainty of human actions determined by character, 100
Chalmers, Thomas, his scientific interest in Theology deepened into practical, 2
on Political Economy as related to Moral Philosophy and Theology, 443
his experience as a minister, 550, 551
Character, determines motive, 93
the ground of divine foreknowledge, 100, 101
permanence of, depends on will, 106
and individual choices not necessarily connected, 120
does not absolutely bind, 121
defined, 157
Charlemagne, his aim, 497, 498

Chastisement in anger," why deprecated by Psalmist? 195
Chastisement, not penalty, the experience of the Christian, 518
Chemistry, present elements of, supposed to be modifications of one common ultimate substance, 6
Cheops, pyramid of, 472
CHERUBIM, NATURE AND PURPOSE, 391-399
Cherubim, Edenic, a symbol of mercy, 392
various meanings assigned to, 391
Milton's view of, 392
common impression regarding, 392
etymology of title obscure, 393
references to in Scripture, 393
occur in Ezekiel, 393
occur in Revelation, 393
are symbols of redeemed humanity, 394
are not personal existences, 394
emblems of human nature possessed of its original perfections, 395
not symbols of nature, 395
emblems of human nature spiritualized and sanctified, 396
represent a humanity abounding in spiritual life, 396, 397
emblems of human nature as the dwelling-place of God, 397
the Edenic, an assurance to the early races that Paradise was still held for man, 398
the Edenic, an assurance that Paradise was only recoverable by a return to holiness and divine communion, 398
the Edenic, a promise that Paradise regained should be more glorious than Paradise lost, 398
their varying relations, lessons from, 398, 399
not illustrations of our future bodies, 399
a revelation of spiritual qualities yet to be the possession of the redeemed, 399
Chicago, a scene in, at opening of civil war, 199, 200
Chivalry, a fruit of the Crusades, 498
"Choice, power of contrary," phrase examined, 97, 98
between motives, not without motives, 122
Choices and fundamental disposition not necessarily connected, 120
Christ, not admitted into Comte's pantheon, 14
his existence inexplicable on the evolution theory 46
the restorer of our prospects of endless development, 162
the extra-temporal, of New Theology, 172-174
the supra-historic, his influence on heathen, 176
implicit faith in, its possibility, 177
Christ, implicit rejection of, its possibility, 177
may be accepted or rejected without a knowledge of his historical manifestation, 177
union with, 178
CHRIST, THE TWO NATURES OF, 201-212
Christ, study of his person a science, 201
Son of man, 201
Son of God, 201
a true man, 201
docetic view unscriptural, 201
had a human body, 201
had a human mind, 201
was subject to laws of human development, 201
tempted because of self-assumed limitations, 201
ignorant of the day of the end, 201
in his twelfth year became conscious of his mission, 202, 226
the ideal man, 202
his physical form, 202, 203
possessed orator's mien, 203
usually plain, but sometimes transfigured, 203
his temperament, 203
Chaucer's description of, 203
combined excellences of both sexes, 204
possessed excellences of greatest and best men, 204
a life-giving man, 204
not explicable by natural antecedents, 205
no invention of men, 205
his humanity came from God, 205
his humanity germinal, 205
conscious of divine Sonship, 206
testimonies to his divinity, 206
Christian consciousness attests his divinity, 206
history attests his divinity, 206
his death has revolutionized history, 207
the centre of history, 207
modern world outgrowth of principles introduced by him, 207
we need his divinity, 208
John of Damascus on his sufferings as related to his divinity, 209
because divine, suffered infinitely, 209
his humanity and deity forever united, 209
all that took place in him shall take place in us, 209
has our whole humanity in heaven, 209
should be recognized in both natures, 210
immediate recognition of him, its importance, 211
the comforter in death, 212
his human nature purged of depravity in womb of Virgin, 214
his relation to race more than federal headship, 215

Christ, not merely constructive, but natural heir of race, ... 215
the great Penitent, ... 216
may be banished to remotest room of believer's heart but cannot be expelled, ... 222
the first thirty years of his life, ... 226, 227
understood, from beginning of his public ministry, its meaning and end, ... 229
the agent of the out-going activity of the Godhead, ... 251
geographical area of his personal ministry 475
advantages of our present doubt as to the places of the great events of his life, ... 479
to secure union with a living, personal, the aim of the Christian ministry, ... 545
presence of, in a minister, the source of healthful attraction, ... 545
the perfect flower and embodiment of humanity, ... 549, 551
resurrection of, type of regeneration, 553
for three years a theological teacher, 553
CHRISTIAN TRUTH AND ITS KEEPERS, ... 238-244
Christianity threatened by Positivism, . 8
the evidence that it is from God, ... 129
its internal characteristics as evidence, ... 129
its external accompaniments as evidence, ... 129
present tendency to lay special stress on internal evidence, ... 129
its internal evidence supplementary, 129
what its internal evidence must cover, 129
disadvantages of the method of individual internal certification of it, .. 130
its internal and external evidences interwoven, ... 131
supernatural facts its very core, ... 131
miracles not its burden but support, . 132
divinely radical, ... 374
works from below upwards, ... 374
estimates "service" by sacrifice, ... 374
missions a great argument for, ... 388
a great argument for missions, ... 388, 389
missions its distinctive mark, ... 388
CHRISTIANITY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY, ... 443-460
Christianity, concrete as well as abstract, ... 445
is salvation for the body and society, 445
accords with natural law, ... 445
is a religion of nature, ... 445
its accordance with laws of nature a proof of its divinity, ... 445
the great assistant of the Political Economist, ... 445
has anticipated the discoveries of Political Economy, ... 445
Christianity, asserts a natural inequality of gifts and stations among men, ... 446
rejected by many working men because it opposes a false Social Science, ... 446
hope of mankind, ... 459
and its resulting ameliorative sciences, connected as parent stem of banyan-tree with succeeding stems, ... 459, 460
its social side, ... 461
recognizes wealth, ... 461
not passivity, ... 550
Christlieb on reason, ... 419
Christo Deo Omnipotenti, as a motto, ... 585
"Christology" a modern coinage, ... 201
Church, an organism, ... 178
its organization not founded on human wisdom, ... 246
is not germinal, ... 246
does not rest on expediency, ... 246
is of permanent obligation, ... 246
its system of organization laid down in New Testament, ... 247
its various parts alluded to in New Testament, ... 247
polity, democratic form of, good for good people, ... 564
Cicero on *honestum* and *utile*, ... 55
Cities, tendency of population to, ... 461
"City which hath foundations" alone can satisfy, ... 483
Classification, fundamental idea of, found in unity of self-consciousness, ... 9
Coal, presence of *coniferæ* in, illustration from, ... 451
Cognition, according to Spencer, recognition, ... 49
Cognitions, primitive, are verities, ... 21
testified to by unintentional acknowledgments of their deniers, ... 22
Coleridge, influence of his writings, ... 5
College and Seminary, how differentiated, ... 284
College, Christian, what? 320
should have actively Christian leaders, ... 320
should give Christian instruction, ... 320
its discipline should be Christian, ... 321
its instruction should be pervaded with a Christian spirit, ... 321
should possess high moral standards, 321
should aim to make its students Christians, ... 321
COLLEGES, OUR, ARE THEY CHRISTIAN? 319-323
Colleges, the true denominational, were intended to be Christian, ... 320
many have ceased to be Christian, ... 322
Collocation, useful, present in universe, 82
its existence assumed by Science, ... 82

Comedy, The Divine, 501-524
some of its translators and interpreters, 501
internal evidence of its date, 501
its introduction, 504, 515
has, according to its author, four meanings, 505
its personal element, 505, 506
a mediæval Pilgrim's Progress, 506
unfolds the author's idea of God's relations to humanity, 506
its interpretation according to Miss Rossetti, 506
has a political meaning, 506, 507
its spiritual meaning its most important, 507
its influence on Italian religious thought, 507
its spiritual meaning unfolded, 507, 508
the first and greatest Christian poem, 508
its cosmology, 508, 509
title "Comedy" why given? 509
has influenced the Italian language, 509, 510
its verse, 510
its description of the Ante-Hell, 510
its description of Hell proper, 510-513
its description of Limbo, 510, 511
its description of the various punishments assigned to delinquents, 511, 513
its description of Dis, 512
its description of the Judecca, 512
its description of Satan, 512, 513
the poem of conscience, 513
contains apt lessons for the present times, 514
its description of Purgatory, 515-518
its Ante-Purgatory, 515, 516
Purgatory proper, 516, 518
Mount of Penitence, 516, 517
is the Christian doctrine of sanctification in verse, 517
its Paradise, 519-521
Beatrice acts as guide, 517, 519
the series of the Heavens, 519, 520
its *Primum Mobile*, 520
its "Rose of the Blessed," 520
describes the poet's celestial love for the beatified Beatrice, 520
each of its three divisions ends with the same word, 521
its intense realism, 523
why an imperishable work of genius, 524
Common-sense, Berkeley appeals to it for proof of existence of ego, 59
Berkeley appeals to it against substance, 59, 63
Communion, Pædo-baptist deprives Baptist of privilege of enjoying it with him, 249
Communists of Paris, their theory as to rent and interest, 452
Comte, Auguste, coryphæus of Nescience, 9
his principal errors, 9
his postulate that we know nothing but matter, examined, 9
his scythe cuts off his own legs, 9
brief review of his system, 9
his classification masterly, 9
his fundamental principles opposed to sound psychology, 9
his position on causation, 10, 11
has no place for Inductive Logic, 11
his analysis of causal judgment, 11
confounds necessary with customary, 11
in admitting tendency of things toward a true philosophy, admits design, 12
his view of Theology and Metaphysics, 13
his new religion, 13, 14, 77
he denies law, in denying cause, 16
his inconsistency as to consciousness, 22
'Conceive,' of God, impossible according to Spencer, 50
the sense in which it is essential to knowledge, 50
the sense in which it is an accident of knowledge, 50
Concupiscence, why excluded by Romanists from list of sins, 102
Condillac, influence of his writings, 7
Epicurean, 32
owes his sensational philosophy to Locke, 7, 58
Congratulations to various graduating classes on finishing their theological education at Seminary, 514, 545, 548, 552, 554, 557, 560, 562, 563, 567, 569, 572, 575, 578, 580, 583
Conscience, its supremacy demonstrated by Butler, 5
what, according to Spencer, 55
its true nature, 55
no tribe found destitute of, 78
an evidence for God, 84
Consciousness, involves in one duality two different things, 6
equally a source of knowledge with observation, 20
Comte's appeal to, 22
is it a mode of force? 24
never transformed into physical or nervous force, 46
Spencer upon, 50
of God, the idealistic formula criticized, 70
in psychology, what? 171
in theology, what? 171
the "ethico-religious," 171
Christian, the doctrine of, defined and discussed, 170-172
Consciousness, self-, its witness to a permanent something underneath and presupposed by all ideas, 65

Conservation of force, not highest law of science, 26
Constantine builds church of Holy Sepulchre, 485
Constantinople, repulse of Moslems from, 485
its influence on Crusaders, 500
Consumers, all are, 464
Consumption, its present rate, 464
of luxuries, not wrong, 464
Conversion, a new choice of motive, 121
God's work and man's work in, 128
Convicted sinner, only finds peace when he sees reparation for sin in the atonement, 219
Cook, Professor, on original constitution of chemical elements, 43
Coöperation of divine and human in act of man, 150
Coöperation, an important factor in resistance to capital, 456
Coöperative establishments, in Paris, 455
in England, 455
their strength and weakness, 455
best form of, 455, 456
Corinthians, Second, 3: 6, 250
5: 23 explained, 218
Corinthian women, the perpetuity of the commands to, 402
Cosmological argument for existence of God, its exact scope, 81
its difficulty in minor premise, 81
Hume's objection to, 81
its difficulty as to character of cause, 81
its value stated, 81
Cosmos, an idea impossible to Positivist, 71
COUNCILS OF ORDINATION: THEIR POWERS AND DUTIES, 259–268
Councils of ordination, see Ordination.
COURAGE, PASSIVE AND ACTIVE, 554–557
Courage, its passive aspect, ὑπομενή, 555
its active aspect, παῤῥησία, 555
Covenanter, the Scotch, of seventeenth century compared with Anglican of same time, 117
Cranmer, an example, 279
Creatianism, nominalistic, 165
Creation, theory of, more credible than that of chance development, 44
absolute, idea of, found among Hebrews only, 45, 81
what, according to Idealism, 72
imperfect, because anticipative of the fall, 111
not a miracle, 132
according to Jewish proverb, 395
Creations, have taken place on our earth, 141, 142
"Creative first cause," man not, 123
Cross, the, its meaning, 582, 583
Crossley adopts coöperative plan, 455
Crozer, his generosity referred to, 301
Crusaders, their *personnel*, 488
two classes of, 492
CRUSADES, THE, 484–500
Crusades, the, their moving principle, 484
their story in brief, 487–489
great leaders in, 488
their social causes, 489–491
demonstrate power of an idea, 489
Guizot's classification of their causes, 489
their moral causes, 491, 492
not owing to papal influence, 491
not prompted solely by hatred of a false faith, 491
not to be explained by mere hatred of the Turk, 491, 492
arose from an awakening of religious feeling, 492
not owing to the grant of Papal indulgences, 492
accompanied by an anticipation of Christ's coming, 493
animated by idea of a world-wide church, 493
Lecky's opinion of, 493
Michaud's opinion of, 493
effects of, 493
secured a transient influence in the East, 494
gave foreign outlet to the brutal forces still inherent in feudalism, 494, 495
Gibbon's opinion of, 494
strengthened barriers against Turkish encroachments, 494
Freeman's opinion of, 494
consolidated states of Europe, 494
Hume's opinion of, 494
Michaud's division of the period of, 495
what advantage they brought to the Roman church, 495
developed the spirit of religious persecution, 495
were disadvantageous in some respects to Roman church, 496
taught those who engaged in them independence, 496
gave occasion for complaints against the popes, 496
disseminated a knowledge of the eternal city, 497
were the initial period of the downfall of the papal power, 497
their effects upon the state, 497–500
their influence on feudalism, 498
compacted the state, 497
favored the absorption of small fiefs into large, 498
their influence best seen in France, 498
diffused the loyal and courteous characteristics of chivalry, 498, 499
opened up intercourse among peoples of Europe, 499
their influence on Mediterranean capitals, 499

Crusades, the, gave an impulse to intellect, ... 500
stimulated the spirit of travel, ... 500
prepared the way for the introduction of Greek literature, ... 500
Curse, the original, its alleviations, ... 391
Curses, divine, prophetic not arbitrary, ... 402
D'Alembert, an Epicurean, ... 32
Damascus, described, ... 483
Damascus, John of, an early theologian, 4
his view of the relation of the natures in Christ's person, ... 209
DANTE AND THE DIVINE COMEDY, 501-524
Dante, Alighieri, his birth, ... 501
the times of his early life, ... 501, 502
his meeting with Beatrice, ... 502
her influence upon him, ... 502, 503
his temporary fall, ... 502
method of his restoration, ... 502, 503
his *Vita Nuova*, ... 503
his thorough preparation for writing the Comedy, ... 503
his remarkable natural and acquired endowments, ... 503
becomes a chief magistrate of Florence, ... 503
banishes the factious nobles, ... 503
is in turn fined and banished, ... 503, 504
his wanderings, ... 504
perhaps visited Oxford, England, ... 504
an amnesty offered him and declined, 504
his bearing under his adversities, ... 504
becomes a Ghibelline, ... 504, 506
his death, ... 504
his idea of humanity and its twofold rule, ... 506
his *De Monarchia*, ... 506
first great advocate of Italian unity, ... 506, 507
first great advocate of independence of church and State, ... 506, 507
distinguishes between the popes and the papacy, ... 507
a loyal Roman Catholic, ... 507
abhorred the papal temporal power, 507
denounces rulers of the church as Antichrist, ... 507
an independent interpreter of Scripture, ... 507
held the Ptolemaic theory of the universe, ... 508
his ideas of the earth, ... 508
his ideas of Hell, ... 508
his ideas of Purgatory, ... 508
his nine Heavens, ... 508, 509
his Empyrean, ... 509
did not call his poem 'Divine,' ... 509
why he called it "Comedy"? ... 509
his remarkable mastery of versification, ... 509, 510
his three great classes of sins, ... 511, 512
his theory of progress in evil, ... 512
Dante, the philosophy underlying his classification and punishment of sins, ... 511-515
why he assigns grotesque punishments to sin, ... 513
his description of Satan, contrasted with that of Milton, ... 513
teaches that sin is a self-perversion of the will, ... 513, 514
a lover of God and holiness, ... 514
does not regard the essence of penalty as external to the sinner, ... 514
his material imagery symbolical ... 514
he makes sin to be its own detecter, judge, and tormentor, ... 514
the two sins of which he deems himself in need of purgation, ... 517
regarded Purgatory as a process, 517, 518
his mistaken views regarding Purgatory, ... 518
ignorant of justification by faith, ... 518
his examination before entering *Primum Mobile*, ... 520
no rough, grotesque poet, ... 521
most sensitive to changeful aspects of nature, ... 521
had an enthusiasm for justice, ... 521
how nicknamed by boys in street, ... 521
the most ethical of poets, ... 521
his delight in light, as symbol of purity, ... 522
his abundant vocabulary to set forth various characteristics of light, ... 522
his vividness of description comes from experience, ... 523
Darwin, obliged to speak of 'design,' ... 12
saw no reason why the series of life on the earth should be toward higher rather than lower forms, ... 28
his researches conducted in a materialistic spirit, ... 31
David, an illustration of divine leading, ... 560
Davis, Noah, virtual founder of American Baptist Publication Society, ... 238
Dead Sea, description of, ... 430
Death, lessons learned in its immediate presence, ... 188
Degeneration, its occurrence apart from effort, the law of this sinful world, ... 248
Delphi, double legend upon the temple there interpreted, ... 4
Democritus, a materialist, ... 32
Denis, St., entry in the Chronicle of, ... 500
Der Einzige, an epithet applicable to every man, ... 156
Design, marks of, according to Positivism, only coincidences, ... 11
implied unintentionally in the language of the Comtists, ... 12
the statement that it implies imperfection in God, examined, ... 12

Design, imperfections of, do not prove absence of purpose in universe, 12
actual imperfections in, can be accounted for on grounds of moral government, 12
seeming imperfections in, may arise from present ignorance, 12
a voluntary self-limitation on the part of God, 12
Maudsley on, 12
Spinoza's view of, 12
its perception, an *a priori* cognition, 48
marks of, everywhere in universe, 181
Determinism, the theory of will so called, 118
opposed by fact that man can choose a less degree of sin, 118, 119
opposed by fact that man can refuse to yield to certain temptations, 119
opposed by fact that unconverted man can give attention to divine truth, 119
would remove guilt, remorse and punishment, 120
advocated by Jonathan Edwards, 120
Deus vult, the watchword of the first Crusade, 487
Development, implied in Mosaic account of creation, 45
prospects of an endless, restored in Christ 162
a true kind of, 559
De Wette, with him scientific interest in religion became practical, 2
D'Holbach, eighteenth century Epicurean, 32
a French Sensationalist, 58
Diaphane, an illustration from, 161
Dictation-theory of Inspiration, see Inspiration.
Diderot, a Sensationalist and Epicurean, 32
Dilemma, one suggested by Spencer's theory of primitive cognitions, 49
Diman, on combinations of law as agencies of ceaseless change, 25
Dis, the city of, Dante's description of, 512
Disposition, included in the larger view of will, 94, 95
involves moral judgments, 94
one may be imperfectly conscious of, 95
consistent with formal freedom, 95
Dissecting-room, a juxtaposition of its *disjecta membra* does not make men, nor a mere accumulation of facts science, 10
Divorce, why permitted to Hebrews, 437
Hebrew wife had no right of, 437
Mosaic restraint upon, 437
in pagan Rome, 410, 411, 437
Docetic views of Christ's person, unscriptural, 201
Docetic views of Inspiration, 153
Dogmatism, True, 557–560
Doré Gustave, his picture of the Deluge, 232
Dorner, on man not being a mere tangent to God, 150
on docetic view of Inspiration, 153
his Eschatology unsatisfactory, 176
'Doth he not leave the ninety and nine?' its interpretation, 368
Doubt, theological, see Minister,
Dragoman, his office and importance, 476
Draper, his antagonism to metaphysics, 8
his statistical averages, 23
Dualism of consciousness, as inexplicable as that of substance, 70
Duns Scotus, an early Nominalist, 164
Dupont, shares profits with his employees, 456
Dwight, Timothy, his views of the nature of sin and virtue, 106
Eagle, a symbol of character, 396
its symbolism in Divine Comedy, 520
Earth, perhaps segregated from rest of universe because of sin, 364
East, Recollections of the, 468–483
Easter-torches, a lesson from method of lighting them at Jerusalem, 257
Economic Science, see Political Economy.
Education, like water rather than vapor, 318
Education of a Woman, 418–430
Education, some results visible, others not, 418
its chief problem, a double one, 418
what etymologically, 418
more than discipline, 418, 419
imparts love and faculty for knowledge, 419
is principally the impartation of truth, 419
the test of its success, 419
"the higher," a new signification given to epithet, 420
requires close study, within a limited sphere, 420
an improved, requires a reformation commencing with elementary training, 425
of John Stuart Mill, 425
of Niebuhr, 425
at Quincy, Massachusetts, 426
when active, begins with a boy, 427
not scholarship, 428
should elicit individuality, 430
Education, female, usually not exact, 420
may it embrace Greek and Latin? 421
should be broad, 421
should embrace all that enters into men's, 421
bon mot regarding, by English bishop, 422
should include physical training, 422

Education, female, should include domestic economy, 422
should develop symmetrically the whole being, 422
effected largely by example, 422
should impart a good manner, 422
should not ignore Bible, 423
not essentially different from a man's, 424
emphasizes studies specially appropriate to the student, 424
should not be on principle of co-education, 424
time given to, at present too limited, 427, 428
arrested by undue attention to trifles, 428, 429
proceeds best in quiet, 429
Educators, their work, 418
Edwards, Jonathan, Bancroft on his services to philosophy and religion, 5
his estimate of philosophical studies, 14
a Berkeleian, 59
based identity on decree of God, 72
his theory of will neglects some facts of the case, 114, 120
on philosophical necessity, 120
through his identity-system Idealism has affected theology, 167
how he became an Idealist, 168
no traducian, 16
his explanation of our union with Adam, 168
denied substance, 168
his theory of imputation, 168
was he a Placean? 168
taught continuous creation, 168
located responsibility not in sin as a nature but as an activity, 168
on Justification, 224
did not wish statements of a material Hell and its physical torments to be understood literally, 514
Efficient cause, what? 92
Ego, alone puts forth and is conscious of force, 42
Egypt, Recollections of, 468–474
Egypt, spring morning in, 468
its welcome to travelers, 468
the landscape in, 470, 471
sunset and night in, 474
donkey-boys of, 470, 473, 474
ignorance of, in middle ages, 500
Election, God's, founded on reasons existing in himself, 108
Elements, chemical, their adaptation to each other, 43
Eliot, George, her writings generally materialistic, 31
on the reward of duty, 161
her moral indifferentism, 531
her exaggeration of heredity, 533
Emerson, on man as here, not to work, but be worked upon, 24
Emerson, his idea of the poet, 525
is better than his philosophy, when he teaches the response 'I can' to duty's 'Thou must,' 533
Emerson, Dr. G. H., his statement as to foundation of doctrine of probation after death, 127
Emmons, on moral character of an action inhering not in its cause but in its nature, 117
on impossibility of independent agency, 169
Empiricism, its influence on Priestley, 7
on other philosophers, 7, 8
Empyrean in Dante's Paradise, 509
Ἐν Θεῷ, 553
Encyclopædists, their philosophy, 7, 32
End in nature controls choice of means, 28
Endosmosis, a certain, of Christian influence, 56
Enthusiasm, defined, 553
Epic poetry always individual in its subjects, 506
Epicureanism, a materialistic development in era of great deterioration, 32
Epicurus, his philosophy antagonized by that of Aristotle and Plato, 15
Erasmus, his policy, 278
Errors, how serviceable, 16
Eternity of matter, if accepted, leads toward atheistic evolution, 57
Ethics, what, according to Spencer? 55
Eugenie, Empress, anecdote of, 465
Europe in thirteenth century, 501, 502
Evangelization of heathen must begin in the family life. 416
Evolution, if proved, merely a mode of divine action. 28
Evolution, The Philosophy of, 39–57
Evolution, the present philosophical fashion, 39
succeeds Positivism, 39
avails itself of spoils of preceding systems, 40
is powerfully advocated, 40
violates the spirit of the Baconian philosophy, 40
rests physical truth on *a priori* reasoning, 41
assumes as postulate an imperfect definition of force, 41
excludes will, 42
teaches that matter, mind and motion come from force, 43, 44
fails in its explanation of life, 45, 46
to some extent recognized by believers in revelation, 45
fails to account for mind, 46
fails to account for soul, 46
fails to account for Christ, 46
fails to explain *a priori* knowledges, 48–50
shuts out knowledge of God, 50–53

Evolution, its exp anation of feeling of moral obligation, 53
teaches that action is right *because* useful, 54
teaches that conscience is the mind's power of comparing utilities, 55
a fascinating system of monism, 55
is destructive of morality, 56
its influence already felt in art and literature, 56
Evolution in the history of a redeemed soul, 161, 162
Ex nihilo omnia fiunt, a suggested axiom for Comte, 10
Exchange, a central doctrine of Political Economy, 450
admits the principle of mutual advantage, 450
Exodus, 15: 11 188
Exegesis, New Testament, should be thorough, 325
should be broad, 325, 326
English, its stages, 326
should be bold, 326, 327, 328
should be reverent, 328, 329
Exercise-system, originates in teaching of Edwards, 168
its nature explained, 169
tends to Pantheism, 169
makes supernatural religion impossible, 169
destroys sense of sin, 169
impugns the divine character, 169
Existence of God, see God.
Experience, requires a prior mental potency, 9
is but "the stern-lights of a ship," 140
warrants merely an expectation, 140
according to Huxley never warrants 'must,' 140
of the truth, not the limit of the preacher's proclamation, 172
Faith, fundamental to philosophy, 21
in our mental powers, a part of our nature, 21
all science in its last analysis rests on, 21
a higher, may be dormant in the soul awaiting divine vivification, 21
defined, 88
a kind of knowledge, 99
Faith, The Measure of Success, 572–575
Fall, see Adam.
Falsehood, every, has a grain of verity, 32
Fanaticism, its nature, 584
Fatalism, refuted by knock-down argument, 21
its rejection does not require acceptance of caprice-theory of will, 99
a false Calvinism merges in, 118
Fatimite Caliphs, their cruelties to Christian pilgrims, 486
Faucet, an unturned, illustration from, 257
Fechner, his "psychology without a soul," 69
'Fetish, Great,' suggested title for earth in the Comtian cult, 13
Feudalism, its nature, 490
influence of Crusades on, 498
Feuerbach, his mechanical philosophy, 31
his maxim, 'man is what he eats.' 37
Fichte, his 'we are all born in faith,' 21
reduces all knowledge to knowledge of self, 60
merges the Absolute in the Ego, 60
his illustration of the unchangeableness of natural sequences, 134, 135
Fijians, matricide among, 411
Final cause, its principle — work toward ends — in ourselves, 26
science dependent on principle of, 26
H. B. Smith's illustration of, 92
Final causes merged by Positivists in totality of secondary or efficient causes, 11, 12, 26
Finality, immanent, or unconscious intelligence. 26
has secured acceptance by many scientists, 26
illustrated by instinct of bee, 26
illustrated by unconscious formation of language, 26
illustrated by spontaneity of genius, 26
a theory which loses sight of man, 27
Finney, Charles G., in Rochester, N. Y., 387
Foraminifera, illustration from, 244
Force, an alleged ultimate, of which perceived forces are modifications, 6
its idea from our consciousness of power present in every act of will, 25
not a property of matter, 33
as observed in arrangements of universe must be mental, 33
must be postulated as behind and previous to all things, 41
an inseparable correlate of effort and will, 41–43
conviction of its existence "deep as very nature of mind," 41
put forth by the ego or mind, 42
the process by which, according to Spencer, it becomes 'forces', unexplained, 42, 43
alone cannot explain motion, 44
according to old and new materialism, 59
Fox, C. J., on Burke's style of oratory, vii
France, the greatest problem of reconstruction there, 452
Francesca da Rimini, how Dante treats the story, 513
Franchise, not necessary appendage of mere humanity, 407
Fraud, its future punishment according to Dante, 512
Free agency, defined, 221

Freedom, human, irreconcilable with divine sovereignty, ... 6
according to determinism, ... 90, 118
according to caprice-theory, ... 90
best method of investigating, ... 90, 91
REMAINDERS OF, IN MAN, ... 114 128
theories of Augustine, Calvin, and Edwards regarding, ... 114
normal, what? 114
and divine sovereignty, how treated by Robertson and Cecil, ... 115, 116
and divine sovereignty, Paul's sublime acceptance of both, ... 115, 116
must not be exclusive *datum* of a system of doctrine, ... 116
according to Fatalism, ... 118
Freedom in unregenerate, to choose a less degree of sin rather than a greater, ... 119
to refuse to yield to certain temptations, ... 119
to do outwardly good acts, ... 119
to seek God from self-interest, ... 119
to give attention to abstract truth from love of it, ... 119
to give attention to God's claims, ... 119
involves responsibility, ... 120
Free will, what? 55
destroyed by Spencer's philosophy, ... 55
can add to original sin, ... 121
French, excel in literary style, ... 538
Frescoes at Pompeii, ... 56
Fundamental disposition of character cannot be self-changed, ... 119
Furies, Greek, punish offenses though unwittingly committed, ... 120
Gallus, Caius Sulpicius, his divorce of his wife, ... 410
Garbett, Bampton lecturer, on contending for the faith, ... 558
Gardner on mind giving matter its chief meaning, ... 36
GARFIELD, PRESIDENT, SERMON PREACHED ON HIS DEATH, ... 347–357
Garfield, President, should remember his character, ... 347, 348
an example of the American type of man, ... 348
his varied career, ... 348, 349
drifts into preaching, ... 348
advocates sound currency, ... 348
his public and private virtues, ... 349
his undue concessions to the pressure of party, ... 354
Garfield's death, attended by alleviating circumstances, ... 349
a permissive providence, ... 349
an answer to prayer, ... 349, 350
a source of blessing to the nation, ... 350
an education in patriotism, ... 350
a quickening of world-wide sympathy, ... 350
not a fruit of conspiracy, ... 351
Garfield's death, should lead to more prayer for our governors, ... 351
should secure a penitent consideration of the national sin which was its indirect cause, ... 351, 352
a time for public utterances, ... 354
its lesson to each citizen, ... 357
'Gender, soul has none,' the statement examined, ... 404
Genesis, 2 : 18 ; 3 : 24, ... 400
Geology, as earth's autobiography, contains no account of its birth, ... 45
Gerbert, an early preacher of Crusades, 486
Gerizim, ascent of, ... 482
Germany, progress of Baptist principles in, ... 243
Giants, the primeval, their punishment in Hell according to Dante, ... 512
Gladiatorial shows at Rome, outcome of a false philosophy, ... 56
God, interpreted by mind, ... 3
according to Mandsley, a mere Brahma, ... 12
limited by nothing outside of himself, 12
self-limited, ... 12, 51, 75, 76
we have an intuitive knowledge of his existence, ... 16
intuitive knowledge of, blunted by sin, ... 16
intuition of, brightened by the coming of Christ, ... 17
his presence in nature, a source of comfort, ... 29
is master of nature, ... 29
can all that he will, but wills not all that he can, ... 43
immanent in universe yet transcendent, ... 46
usually works by natural laws, ... 46
may work by direct exercise of will, 46
his existence an *a priori* truth, ... 48
in what sense cognized by human mind, ... 50
can know him without a mental image of him, ... 51
in what sense infinite, ... 51, 76
in what sense absolute, ... 51, 75
we know him in relation, ... 52
Spencer practically confesses to a knowledge of, ... 52
according to Berkeley may directly cause sensations, ... 58
his existence not defensible by Idealist, ... 69
according to Idealism, is a series of ideas, ... 70
can do more than create ideas, ... 71
may give relative independency to portions of physical force, ... 71
knowledge of, its conditions, ... 71, 89
the term defined, ... 75
duty of those destitute of affectional conditions for knowledge of, ... 89

God, the direct author of sin in the heart, according to scheme of Hopkins and Emmons, ... 117
influence of Nominalism on conceptions of his nature and attributes,.. 164
as "the simply One," unknowable,... 165
idea of, lost with that of substance,.. 166
immanence of, unduly prominent in New Theology, ... 167
as described in one hundred and fourth Psalm, ... 181
his relation to Cosmos as set forth by Paul, ... 181
not an unintelligent, unconscious principle, ... 181
as the author of man, must himself think and will, ... 181
a personal Being in the highest sense, 182
possesses a will of infinite freedom and power, ... 182
is sufficient to himself, ... 182, 183
his eternal independence and self-sufficiency rest on the Trinity in his nature, ... 183, 191
not compelled to create, ... 183
present in all "laws of nature," 184
above all "laws of nature," 185
nature to him as "a loose mantle," ... 185
offended as a living person by sin,.... 185
reconciled himself by Atonement,... 186
personally interested in Creation, Providence and Redemption,..... 186
his will and heart seen in Incarnation and Atonement, ... 187
his attributes, their nature, ... 189
self-preserving, ... 191
his working in a soul in no sense suspends its activities, ... 550
God, existence of, not demonstrable by argument. 80
proposed arguments for, four,..... 81–85
Cosmological argument for, ... 81
Teleological argument for, ... 82, 83
Moral or Anthropological argument for, ... 83, 84
Ontological argument for, ... 84
defects in all arguments for, ... 84, 85
presupposed in all logical processes,. 85
an intuitive knowledge, ... 86
his leadings in Providence, ... 560, 561
his leadings by the Spirit, ... 561, 562
God, Holiness of, its first mention in Bible, ... 188
perfect, ... 190
proceeds from his very being, ... 190
is sublimely energetic, ... 190
asserts itself, ... 190, 191
is a positive thing, ... 191
not a mere antithesis to evil, ... 191
its relation to his justice, ... 191
its relation to law, ... 192
finds expression in his anger, ... 192
its relation to benevolence,..... 193
God, holiness of, not utilitarian,..... 194
is not love to universe, ... 194
is not a means to an end, ... 194
co-existent with his love, ... 195
his primary and fundamental attribute.., ... 195, 196
light thrown upon its place in divine character by man's moral constitution, ... 195, 196
is reason for punishment of persistently sinful, ... 197
and his love, reconciled in Atonement, 197
its majesty set forth in life and death of Christ, ... 198
enhances his love to sinners, ... 198
sight of, preliminary often to a sight of the divine love, ... 199
the practical effects of the study of,.. 199
God, idea of, may be described as characterizing human nature, ... 76
its prevalence among mankind,..... 76–79
present when not formally asserted,.. 77
present though rudimentary, ... 77
men in mass have entertained, ... 77
testimonies to the generality of,..... 78
implicit existence of, how attested,.. 78
developed on suitable occasion being given, ... 78, 79
how accounted for, ... 79–87
not from external revelation,..... 79
presupposed in either true or false religions, ... 79
not from sense-perception or reflection, ... 79, 80
not from consciousness, ... 80
not from conscious process of reasoning, ... 80
intuitive, ... 86
God, intuitive knowledge of, dimmed by sin, ... 86
influence of argument on, ... 87
helped by revelation, ... 87
assumed by Scripture, ... 87
Spencer denies that it is adequate to purposes of science, ... 87
not an accretion of past experiences, 87
not present with brutes..... 87
infinite, and cannot therefore arise from any combination of finites,... 87
as valid as any belief in the Unknowable or in the Persistence of Force, 87
is a faith, and yet is foundation of a science, ... 88
God, justice of, is transitive holiness,.. 191
requires creation for its existence,... 192
the publication and enforcement of his nature, ... 192
reveals law..... 192
is legislative holiness, ... 192
is executive holiness, ... 192
the detecter and punisher of moral evil, ... 192
consistent with compassion, ... 193

God, justice of, is not capricious, 193
invariable, 195, 196
God, love of, what it is, 193
cannot be resolved into holiness, 193, 194
chooses its objects, 195
the ground of his chastisements, 195
not the ground of punishment, 195
co-exists with holiness, 195
is optional, 196
conditioned by holiness, 196
absent from the inflictions of the future, 197
and his holiness, reconciled in Atonement, 197
best understood in light of his holiness, 198
God, The Living, 180–187
'God, the living,' a common designation in Scripture, 180
the promulgation of its idea, the duty of the Hebrews, 180
implies an all-originating and all-sustaining life in God, 180
implies that God has a life of the Spirit, conscious, intelligent and self-determining, 180
a conception of, delivers from the tyranny of the modern idea of law, 183
a conception of, gives new vividness and reality to God's dealings with our individual souls, 185
brightest revelation of, in the incarnation, 187
'God's Providence our Inheritance,' 561
Good deeds, after doer's death rise to heaven, 330
live on earth, 330
Gottesbewusstsein, 80
Graduation, feelings suitable to the occasion of, 544
Gravitation, its nature unknown, 33
a uniform and conscious expression of mind and will, 42
Greek Exegesis, A Great Teacher of, 330–336
Greek literature, its introduction into Europe, 500
Green, a Hegelian, 61
Gregory of Nyssa, opposes pilgrimages, 485
Growth into moral goodness impossible in fallen man, 112
Guibert, Abbot, on the Crusades, 492
Guizot, on Providence, 390
on causes of Crusades, 489, 490
Gunsaulus, Transfiguration of Christ, quoted, 74
Gustavus Adolphus, his public vow, 228
Guy of Lusignan, his career, 490
Gymnasium a useful appendage to a Theological Seminary, 307
Gymnasia, German, have an elementary theological course, 321
Bible closely studied in, 423
Habit, what? 575
how cultivated, 577
Habits In The Ministry, 575–578
Hackett, Professor Horatio B., Address at his Funeral, 330–336
Hackett, Professor Horatio B., on increase of educated ministers about Boston, 301
caught his exegetical enthusiasm from Stuart of Andover, 331
became a Baptist, 331
the Nestor of Greek exegesis in Baptist denomination, 331
his influence not confined to Baptists, 332
his characteristics as a teacher, 332–335
revisits Germany, 335
his sudden death, 335
wide-spread regret at, 336
his death alluded to, 554
Hadrian, his demolition of Jerusalem, 484
Hale, Sir Matthew, his belief in witches, 147
Hall, Robert, loses his materialistic views at the grave of his father, 37
Hamilton, Sir William, on no difficulty emerging in theology which has not emerged in philosophy, 14
the injurious consequences of his doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, 16
relegates idea of divine existence to realm of faith, 16, 88
his teachings opened up way to Idealism, 16
sought to remedy defects of Reid, 61
showed absurdity of representative perception, 62
admitted a vitiating ideal element into our knowledge of an external object, 62
failed to explain why *non-ego* must be extended, 62
the limits of his Natural Realism, 62
his concessions to Idealism, 62
his classification of Idealists, 62, 63
his treatment of Objective Idealism, 63
his reply to T. Collyns Simon, 64
grants too much to Berkeley, 64
on logical absurdity of demonstrating the absolute from the relative, 84, 85
his view of will, 123
Haroun al Raschid, his generosity, 485
Harris, a Hegelian, 61
Hartley, his theory of vibrations, 7
Hartmann, a contributor to our knowledge of the facts of man's nature, 97
Harvard, feelings in its Memorial Hall, 277
its legend, 285
Hazard on foreknowledge not essential to supreme governing power of universe, 100
Heathen, our impression of their guilt weakened by New Theology, 176
can claim nothing from God, 176
are guilty, 176

Heathen, have a manifestation of Christ in this life, 176
have a universal sense of sin, 176
Christ is doing supra-historic work among them, 176
may have an implicit faith in Christ, 177
may implicitly reject him, 177
Heathen lands, Christ yearns over, more than over Christian, 369
Heaven, its rewards, 160, 161
a realm of crowned heads, 162
a place of historic retrospect, 365
Heavens, the nine of Dante, 508, 509
Hebrews, their purpose in history, 180
Hebrews 2: 11, ("of one"), explained, 209
Hegel developed the subjective tendencies of Kant's philosophy, 8
the influence of his transcendental Idealism, 31
his explanation of the development of the One into the Many, 60
makes the rational the real, 60
his system opposed by the fact that personal wills war against the rational, 60
with him "thinking thinks," 61, 70, 166
his teachings, a counter-weight to agnostic materialism, 61
has found able advocates, 61
his teachings end by opposing facts of history and morality, 61
regards God as universal, impersonal intelligence and will, 167
his view of the soul, 167
on Christianity 'seeking the living among the dead,' 484
Hegelian revival, these are days of, 533
Helena, and the Holy Places of the East, 455
Hell, according to Dante, 508
inscription over its gate, 510
sign of God's estimate of sin, 514
its fire and brimstone, of what symbolical, 514
many men already there in this life, 514
ascent from, to Purgatory, how accomplished, 515
Hell-gate rock, illustration from its removal, 380
"Help-meet" explained, 400
Henry Fourth at Canossa, 487
Heredity, confirmatory of Scripture doctrine of unity of race, 165
Hickok's illustration of the principle of causality, 10
Higginson's question, "Ought women to learn the alphabet," 421
HIGH-MINDEDNESS, 580-583
Hildebrand, his character, 486
his failure to originate a Crusade, 486
History, on Spencer's principles, a fatalistic development, 55
HISTORY, CHURCH, AND ONE WHO TAUGHT IT, 337-343
History, mediæval, its cardinal point, 497
History, and natural history, related, 339
Hohenstaufen, house of, its efforts, 497
Holbach, D', J. Baron, a French sensationalist philosopher, 58
HOLINESS OF GOD, THE, 188-200
Holiness, a reward of heaven, 161
what? 189
only approximate among men, 189, 190
binding on men apart from results, 194
its supremacy will be acknowledged by an assembled universe, 200
Holland, its pile-supported cities, illustration from, 3
Holmes on man, 13
Holy-places, their true place in religion, 484
Holyoake's description of the results of Positivism, 13
Homiletics, a part of Theological Seminary training, 304
Honestum, Cicero on, 55
Hooker, on Inspiration, 148
Hopkins, on the moral quality of an action being only in its nature, 117
on God as the cause of every event, 169
Horse-back riding in Palestine, 475
Hotchkiss, Rev'd V. R., D. D., a teacher of Bible in the original languages at Rochester Theological Seminary, 344
an ardent lover and student of the Bible, 344
his general information, 346
peculiarities of his instruction, 346
love of Bible-lands, 346
Howe, John, on inscription on Temple at Delphi, 4
Hughes, Archbishop, on the impressibility of early life, 416
'Humanity collective,' an object of worship in Comte's new religion, 13
Hume, David, makes a further application of Berkeley's principle, 59, 166
Sydney Smith's witticism upon, 59
his exclamation to Ferguson, 78
urges that he never saw a world made, 81
stigmatizes miracle as a violation or suspension of natural law, 133
his argument against miracles a *petitio principii*, 143, 144
Humility, Augustine on, 582
Humists, what the soul is to them, 50
some modern, 59
Hunt on matricide among Fijians, 411, 412
Hunt, Holman, his "Shadow of the Cross" referred to, 202
"Husband of one wife," its meaning, 441
Husbandmen, excluded from Plato's ideal government, 447
Huxley, Thomas, the subservience of some divines to him, 9
his researches conducted in a materialistic spirit, 31

Huxley, Thomas, declares spontaneous action an absurdity, 36, 37
his definition of matter, 59
on the absurdity of wasting time on "lunar politics," 75
on substituting the "must" of necessity for the "will" of law, 140
Hypocrisy, its future punishment according to Dante, 512
Ice-floe, illustration from an incident upon, 256
Idea, in nature, what? 34
as regarded by absolute Idealist, 62
in non-egoistical Idealism, 62
does not guarantee actual existence, 84
according to Hegel, 97
Ideal, an, its advantage to the young, 19
Ideas, in nature, solely product of mind, 33
according to Berkeley, 63
according to modern Idealism, 65
distinct from cognition of them, 65
and things, distinct from each other according to common-sense, 66
Idealism, declares matter spirit, 6
its consummation, pantheism, 8
IDEALISM, MODERN, 58–74
Idealism, its teaching, 58
originates with Locke, 58
as taught by Hume, 59
as taught by Humists, 59
its mischievous effects, 59
Kant's reaction against, 59, 60
Fichte's modification of, 60
of Hegel, extreme, 60, 61
of Hegel, its influence, 61
Hamilton's concessions to, 62–64
Hamilton's classification of, 62
Idealism, modern, how held by Lotze, 63
Berkeley's varying views of, 63
reasons for its prevalence, 64, 65
the objective form of, freest from objection, 65, 66
objective form of, compared with natural realism, 66
assumes that mind can know only ideas, 66
inconsistent with itself, 66
must grant existence of self before cognition of ideas, 66, 67
cannot consistently maintain that the object perceived is different from the act of perception, 67
Professor Knight on, 67
ignores difference between body and idea of body, 67
confounds outness with distance, 67, 68
finds in self the ground of unity for mental phenomena, 68
should find in material substance ground of unity for material phenomena, 68
Idealism, modern, confounds conditions of external knowledge with objects of knowledge, 68, 69
each advocate of, must consistently deny existence of any other save himself, 69
takes refuge in consciousness of God, 69, 70
view of God, according to, 70
is monistic, 70
denies that mind can know matter, 70, 71
its influence on Christian faith, 71–74
destroys distinction between possible and actual, 71, 72
destroys distinction between truth and error, 72
should logically declare that God is the only cause in the realm of spirit, 72, 73
strikes at the roots of morality, 73
leads to solipsism, 73
as injurious as materialism, 73, 74
why opposed by Hamilton, 73
best remedy for, 74
its advocates, 166
its nature, 166
teaches an exaggerated individualism, 166
commencing in particulars ends by giving up individuality, 167
adopted by many modern theologians, 167
Identity, absolute, the system of, declares matter and spirit forms of one underlying substance, 6
Identity, based by Jonathan Edwards on the absolute decree of God, 71
system of Edwards and the New Theology, 167
Idolatry, what? 484
Image, mental, not necessary to knowledge, 50
Imagination, what? 527
alone, will not make a poet, 531
shares in man's eternal progress, 543
Impressions, mental, require thing impressed and thing which impresses, 43
Incontinence, sins of, according to Dante, 511
Inconceivability, to make it a test of knowledge, erroneous, 51
Indestructibility of matter, a relative not an absolute truth, 44
INDIVIDUALISM, CHRISTIAN, 156–163
Individuality, typified by nature, 156
in men's bodies and souls, 156
illustrates God's freedom, 156
men's, inferences from, 157–163
implies that each is guilty of peculiar sins, 157
of sin, renders it a peculiar insult to God and influence for evil, 157
of sin, requires a peculiar account to God, 157

Individuality, of sin, renders each "the sinner" and "chief of sinners," 158
of man, requires the adaptation of peculiar wisdom and grace to save him, 158
requires a personal election and call, 158
requires an intercession on behalf of each, 158
requires personal leadings of Providence, 159
requires special discipline, 159
involves a special experience, 159
implies a peculiar work to do for God, 159, 160
involves a peculiar reward, 160
raised in heaven to its intensest power, 161
should be characteristic of minister, 555
Induction, Dr. Porter on, 85
Dr. Peabody on, 85
warrants only an expectation, 140
rests ultimately on fact of universal design, 140, 141
Inertia, a property of matter, 33
means that matter is not self-moving, 44
Infinite, because undefined, said to be unknowable, 51
God is, as being the ground of the finite, 51, 76
Inspiration, Its Method, 148–155
Inspiration, differences of opinion as to method of, 148
the dictation theory of, according to Hooker, 148
involves instances of direct dictation, 148
a manifestly human element in, 148
Quenstedt's view of, 148
dictation-theory of, will not cover all the facts, 149
dictation-theory, passage alleged in its favor, examined, 149
dictation-theory of, contradicts the usual method of God's working in the soul, 149
is a union of the human and the divine, 150, 153
is more than mere "general instructions," 150, 151
the help of God granted in, 161
something like the *afflatus* experienced by divinely helped preacher, 151, 152
theorists upon, affected by their views of the miraculous, 152
in, God speaks *through* not *to* man, 153
more than illumination, 153
God in, can transcend the powers of man's mental and moral nature, 153
docetic view of inspiration, 153
its products attract by their humanness, 153
permits every imperfection in its products not inconsistent with truth, 153
Inspiration, how knowledge is communicated therein, 153
defined, 153
does not require the communication of words, 154
in what sense it extends to all Scripture, 155
are there degrees of? 155
Browning's teachings on, 535
'Instruments in the hands of God,' the statement guarded, 550
Intellectual nature, man's, disproves materialism, 35
Intellectual Philosophy, its results as real as those of physical observation, 20
Intellectual pursuits, their advantages, 563
Intelligence, theory of an unconscious, in nature, stated and refuted, 26, 27, 83
Intelligences, myriads engaged in divine messages to this earth, 364
Interpretation, New Testament, 324–329
Interpretation, Biblical, its status at end of second quarter of the century, 331
fourfold, according to Dante, 505
Intuition, Schelling's theory of direct, 60
its relation to truth, 171
Intuitions, primitive, called into consciousness by outward influences, 21
cannot be got rid of, 22
what according to Spencer, 50
Kant's view of, 60
more than regulative, 60
Irving, Edward, his error, 215
Isaiah's vision, its bearing on missions, 389
Isocrates' encomium on Heraclitus applied to Browning, 542
Italian cities in the middle ages, 499
Jackals in Palestine, 477
Jaffa visited, 477
James, Henry, his novels characterized, 561
Janet, on will setting in motion a series of events which could not have occurred without its interposition, 24
Jeremiah, 10 : 10, 180
Jericho, its ruins, 477
Jerome opposes pilgrimages, 485
Jerusalem, its appearance, 478
Jesus, Society of, as an example, 367
Jevons, on author of Baconian philosophy, 40
Jocularity not incompatible with seriousness, 536
John of Damascus, an early theologian, 4
John, 21 : 21, 22, 156
John the Baptist, his mission, 227
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, of Yale, his influence on Jonathan Edwards, 168
Jones, Sir William, on "What constitutes a State?" 447
Joppa visited, 477

Jordan, the varied character of its course, 476
Josephus, description of Christ in his works interpolated, 203
Joy, a reward of Heaven, 161
Jude, 3. expounded, 558
Judea, Wilderness of, its description, 479
Judecca, the lowest Hell according to Dante, 512, 513
Judgment, the final, John Nelson's dream of, 529
Kaffirs, Koussa, state of women among, 411
Kant, outcome of his philosophy, 8
his idea of our conception of God, 16
his revolt against idealistic skepticism, 59, 61
showed that sense perceptions involve *a priori* conceptions, 60
failed to see that the testimony to the noumena is as valid as that to the phenomena, 60
only claimed for intuitions a subjective or regulative existence, 60
his refutation of the ontological argument for the existence of God 84
maintained that things conform to cognition not cognition to things, 84
on women's carrying learning for show as they carry useless watches, 422
Kaulbach's picture in the Royal Museum, Berlin, referred to, 17
Kemble, Mrs., her impulse when before an audience, 429
Kentucky, underground rivers of, types of human impulses below consciousness, 96
'Kept,' its double meaning in Genesis 3 : 24, 393
Khayyam, Omar, his fatalistic teaching, 533
Kindergarten, its success, 425
KINGDOM OF GOD AND ITS COMING, 358-367
Kingdom of God, Christ its King, 358
world-kingdoms imperfect types of, 358
the only truly universal monarchy, 359
how prophesied, 359
set up in soul, 360
its pledge of naturalization, the Holy Spirit, 360
typified by divine rule in nature, 360
is of grace and not of force, 361
an actual union with the life of God in Christ, 362
is one, 362
its erection the great end of God's economy of redemption, 363
is not of this earth alone, 363
once established is never destroyed, 364
its almost incredible greatness, 365
it shall come, 365
agencies through which it comes, 365
demands the best energies of every young man, 366
Kingdom of God, its majesty furnishes an incitement to labor, 366
it shall be a blessed place to the true laborer, 367
to foes a falling stone grinding to powder, 367
King's Chamber in Great Pyramid, 473
Kingsley, Charles, on ancient tragedy, 533
Kinship with the sinning a ground of sympathetic suffering, 217
'Know' explained as 'limit' or 'define,' 51
Knowledge rests on more than facts, 10
Spencer's theory of, 47
according to Spencer, transformed sensations, 50
its sources according to Locke, 58
involves more than is conveyed by sensation, 68
does not require identity between knower and thing known, 70
how much a man may lawfully acquire, 463
Knowledge, relativity of, 47
term borrowed from Mansel and Hamilton, 47
a watchword of Spencer's philosophy, 47
puts into our knowledge a vitiating subjective element, 47
a reprehensible mystification of truth, 48
Knox, encomium upon, 557, 280
Krauth on Idealism, 71
Krupp, adopted co-operative system at Essen, 456
Labor, its advantages to a sinful race, 391
its place in Political Economy, 446
chief origin of wealth, 446
Hobbes on, 446
Adam Smith on, 446
division of, its advantages, 448
productive and unproductive, 449
its value rests on mental and moral qualities entering into, 449
its value ascertained by regarding it as "service," 449
is likely to have a larger share of profits than previously, 455
Landor, Walter Savage, on Browning, 535
Language, formation of, an instance of unconscious intelligence, 26
Laplace, his scheme of universe, 44
Law, fixed and not phenomenal, 10
produces phenomena, 10
involves causation, 11
essential to logic, 11
natural, God's ordinary channel of working, 46
imperceptible to the senses, 48
new conception of, confirmatory of Scripture-realism, 165
perfection of divine, 176
as related to God, 184
tyranny of modern idea of, 184

Law, not an exhaustive expression of divine will, 185
God's, a transcript of his being, 192
holiness in requirement, 192
divine and human, not co-ordinate, 245, 246
Laws of nature, what? 184
how man uses them, 184, 185
Laying-on of hands in Ordination, conveys no new grace, 265
symbolic of public side of ordination, 265
conveys authority, 265
Leadership, Training For, 314-318
Leaders, church must have, 314
Leadership desirable in the church, 314
training for needed, 315
requires confidence in the truth, 317
Leadings, God's, 560-562
Learning, according to Lord Bacon, 463
Leaving the Ninety and Nine, 368-377
Lecky's philosophy, its results, 58
Leclaire, his conduct as employer, 455
Leibnitz, his *nisi intellectus*, 58
Leighton, Archbishop, on the ministry, 299
Lessing, on a revelation revealing nothing, 129
Lewes, his antagonism to metaphysics, 8
his idea of philosophy, 49
Leyden jar, brain resembles, 552
Licensure, what? 260
Life, superior to mechanical and chemical forces, 34
its relation to protoplasm, 34
reveals idea both in animal and plant, 34
originates from preceding life, 35
not the result but cause of organization, 35
its origin from inorganic elements, an unscientific assumption, 35
comes from an immaterial source, 35
a reward of heaven, 161
present, finality of its decisions, 177
human, modern idea of its sacredness, 207
'Like people, like priest,' good sense of adage, 557
Limitation, self-, divine, involved in God's perfection, 75
greatest proof of will and power, 186
shown in person of Christ, 186
Lion-like features of character, what? 396
Lives, human, according to Pantheism, 8
'Living creatures,' term applied to cherubim, 396
'Living Temple,' Howe's, alluded to, 4
Locke, his influence, 5, 7
derives our knowledge from sensation, 58
his notion of reflection, 58
not always consistent, 58
his dictum, 58
opened the way to French sensationalism, 58
influence of his teaching on morals, 58
Locke, influence of his teaching on religion, 58
influence on Berkeley, 58
Kant's criticism on his system, 60
on Inspiration, 155
influence on modern Idealism, 166
Logic, an overweening, at war with the existing qualities of nature, 6
requires recognition of law, 11
Lombards and Pope Alexander III, 499
Lotze, his Idealism, 62
Love defined, 193
"Love and Death," a painting by Watts, 525
"Love and Life," a painting by Watts, 525
Lucretius revived in modern materialists, 39
the influence of his teachings, 56
Luke 24 : 26, 213
Luther, his mistake in not founding Theological Seminaries, 300
Luxuries, required by high mental development, 464
consumption of, how far right for Christian, 464, 467
Luxury, must not waste money in, 465
a temperate, what? 465
must be consistent with love of God and man, 465
must not be permitted to harden heart, 466
must not make this life the chief object, 466
must be means to a higher end, 466
must not interfere with claims of religion, 466
indulgence in, a question of personal conscience, 466, 467
Lyall, William, on will, 123
Lyell, Sir Charles, on geology as earth's autobiography, 45
M. C. B., the legend on the Maccabean standard, 367
Madonna della Seggiola of Raphael, described, 413
Maker, in what sense man is, 527
Malice, its punishment according to Dante, 512
Man ist was er isst, 37
Man, a drop of water which can reflect heaven and earth, 8
each, born an Aristotelian or Platonist, 23
a microcosm, 24
conquers nature, 24
is what he eats, says Feuerbach, 37
cannot be evolved from mere brute, 46
a drop of water which chooses whether it will fall into the Rhine or Rhone, 123
the power which gave him being must think and will, 181
never absolutely holy in this world, 189, 190

Man, his duty to himself, 190, 191
the intelligence and voice of nature, 395
before Fall, perhaps the climax of creaturely perfection, 395
ennobled by the possession of the qualities typified by the cherubim, 395, 396
how related to Pope and Emperor according to Dante, 506
Mandeville, Sir John, his travels, 500
Manhood, dignity of, taught by Christianity, 447
taught by Political Economy, 447
not an intuitive idea, 447
denied by greatest masters of ancient thought, 447
its development the aim of social science, 448
prohibits that man be *used*, 448
MANHOOD IN THE MINISTRY, 548–557
Mansel, his treatment of religious faith unsatisfactory, 16
his suggested practical answer to Fichte's illustration of the unchangeableness of natural sequences, 135
Maories, fate of a wise man among, 318
Mar Saba, ascent to, 480
Marheinecke, on the improbability of women becoming too learned, 430
Marriage, covenant of, in Eden, 400
what it is, 406
age for, discussed, 428
unlawful in one State may be lawful in another, 434
valid though both parties go into another State to evade laws of their own, 436
by a person divorced in N. Y. State, valid in that State, if legally consummated in another, 434
to deceased wife's sister, though legally consummated in Denmark, held invalid in England, 434
law of domicile applies to, according to Lord Chancellor Campbell, 434
Judges Westbrook and Story would apply law of domicile to, 434
of a person in N. Y. State not dissolved by a divorce issued in Ohio, 435
should be equally with divorce under law of domicile, 435
Bishop denies that law of domicile applies to, 436
"wretched condition of law regarding," 437
law of Scripture regarding, 437–440
sanctity of, among Hebrews, 437
formalities prescribed by Mosaic law before its dissolution, their beneficent intent, 437
Christ's exposition of its original law, 438
some modification of Christ's teaching by St. Paul, asserted and denied, 438
Marriage, not a mere civil contract, 442
an ordinance of God, 442
is the mutual merging in one another of the personal liberties of the contractors, 442
not a mere partnership, 442
not a sacrament, 442
yet it is sacred, 442
law regulating, a part of international law, 433
has legal ubiquity of operation, 433
its validity to be decided by law of place where celebrated, 433
may be declared null and void in certain cases, wherever celebrated, by express declaration of statute, 433
though illegal if contracted within N. Y. State, yet if contracted without the State is not illegal, because of absence from Statutes of express clause declaring such marriage null and void, 433
the state of law in U. S. A. concerning, 434
Brook vs. Brook, 434
Cropsey vs. Ogden, 435
Erkenbrach vs. Erkenbrach, 437
Kerrison vs. Kerrison, 434
Marshall vs. Marshall, 432, 433, 434
O'Dea vs. O'Dea, 437
People vs. Baker, 435
People vs. Hovey, 436
Ponsford vs. Johnson, 434
Thorp vs. Thorp, 436
Van Voorhis vs. Brintnall, 436
Martineau, James, on philosophers braining themselves, 9
on statistical averages, 24
on 'the ought to be other than what is,' 3
Martyr, Justin, on the youth of Christ, 202
Massey, Gerald, the poet of labor, quoted on its anticipations, 457
Mastery of self, its nature, advantages and conditions, 563–566
Material cause, what? 92
Materialism, its vicious efforts after monism, 6, 7
the drift of unbelief in the present day, 31
colors science, literature, education, philanthropy and theology of the time, 31
must be met and neutralized by Christianity, 31
what? 31, 32
propounded by Democritus and Epicurus, 32
rises in periods of national and social declension, 32
contains a small amount of truth, 32
a protest against Idealism, 32
ignores anything above or behind the existence and working of material elements, 32

Materialism, its refutation from three different sources,---32–38
furnishes no proper cause for the universe, --- 33
its doctrine that force is a property of matter untenable, --- 33
cannot explain the force subjected to idea present in the universe,---33, 34
cannot explain the phenomena of life, 34
disproved by facts of our being,--- 35
cannot educe intellect from matter,-- 35
cannot reduce to physical measurements thought or feeling,--- 35
regards mind as a tablet on which sensations make their mark,--- 35
cannot make thought a link in any series of material phenomena,--- 35
in its suggested explanation of mind contradicts facts of consciousness,- 36
destroys free will,--- 36
its determinism,--- 36
its outcome rigidly necessitarian.---36, 37
annihilates conscience,--- 37
how Martineau came to revolt against it, --- 37
gives up immortality of soul,--- 37
logically, it is Atheism,---37, 38
disproved by facts of our religious nature,--- 38
in what it originates,--- 38
refuted by a sense of sin in the soul,- 38
cannot explain the person of Christ,-- 38
impossible to the Berkeleian,--- 58
monistic in its scheme of the universe, --- 70
an *argumentum ad ignorantiam*,--- 70
Materialistic Skepticism,---31–38
Mathematical truth, merely phenomenal, according to Positivism,--- 11
Matter, interpreted by mind,--- 3
and spirit, neither can be ignored,--- 6
in the act of knowing it, what other acts involved,--- 9
what, according to Positivism,--- 11
not a sufficient cause for universe,--- 33
in its last analysis, what?--- 43
Boscovitch's idea of, --- 43
if force, purely subjective.--- 43
known with the same certainty we know our existence,--- 43
not developed from loose forces in an empty void,--- 44
indestructibility of, no *a priori* truth, 44
its inertia,--- 44
its motion inexplicable without adjustment, --- 44
external, Berkeley declined to postulate as cause of sensations,--- 58
definition of, by Mill,--- 59
definition of, by Huxley,--- 59
supposition of its existence, contrary to common-sense according to Berkeley, --- 59
Matter, according to prevailing philosophy, 'only definable in terms of sensation,' --- 64
only has meaning in connection with mind,--- 65
its eternity held by most ante-Christian and many modern philosophers, 81
Maudsley, on design implying imperfection in God,--- 12
Maxwell, Professor Clerk, on atoms as 'manufactured articles,'--- 44
McCosh, James, his scheme of philosophy midway between Nescient and Omniscient schemes,--- 15
Medicine, students of, in danger of passing over spiritual facts,--- 19
Mechanical philosophy, the present vogue, --- 31
employment destructive of virtue according to Aristotle,--- 447
Memphis visited,---470, 475
Mental energy, not a physical force,--- 35
not measured by physical tests,--- 35
Mental facts, demonstrable,--- 20
Mercantile theory, of Political Economy, its teachings and effects,--- 449
Metaphysical inquiry equally valid with physical, --- 20
Metaphysics, denied by philosophy of Nescience, --- 8
and theology, both declared by Comte a relic of the infancy of the race,--- 13
a science of,--- 20
at basis of all other science,---20, 21
many terms of science have their meaning from,---21, 22
unconsciously admitted by deniers,-- 22
Metellus, Censor, his opinion of women, ---410, 411
Middle Ages, great idea of,--- 492
Mihi Vivere Christus, a motto,--- 585
Mill, John Stuart, his erudition and acumen,--- 8
his inconsistency in use of word 'cause,' --- 22
his opinion of validity of mathematical axioms,--- 49
a Humist,--- 59
his definition of matter,--- 59
his definition of mind,--- 59
his object of worship,--- 77
his argument from seeming imperfections in nature,--- 83
on '*Subjection of Women*,'--- 403
on marriage,--- 407
his portrait,--- 525
his idea of God in relation to universe, --- 542
Milton, John, his influence on English religious thought,--- 507
Mind, not a modification effected in brain of a common ultimate physical force,--- 6

Mind, what, according to philosophy of Nescience, ... 8
as open to investigation as matter, ... 9
what, according to Positivism, ... 11
in nature, as plain to observer as intelligence in other men is plain to him, ... 27
presents the truest image of God, ... 28
active in its knowing, ... 35
connected with but not identical with matter, ... 35
its testimony to its own nature, ... 36
cannot be got from matter, ... 46
not a *tabula rasa* at start, ... 48
its *a priori* cognitions, ... 48
defined by Mill, ... 59
defined by Berkeley, ... 59
not an idea, ... 66
not a succession of feelings, ... 66
Minister, its meaning, ... 250, 449
Christian, regard bestowed on his person in early New England days, ... 285
his office now too generally regarded as a mere profession, ... 286
should have a conviction that he is called of God, ... 286
characteristics prominent in his youth, ... 545
his true influence arises from presence of Christ within, ... 545
the advantages which flow from his possession of the self-sacrificing spirit of Christ, ... 548
his two great principles, ... 548
must be a true man, ... 548, 551
his manhood to be sought in Christ, .. 549
what he is not, ... 549
should seek after a self-determined activity of all his powers, ... 550
should be a man of one purpose, ... 551
his pulpit should be the focus of a world-wide whispering-gallery, ... 551
should preach as possessing 'one only life,' 551, 559
dependent on God for power, ... 552
obtains spiritual influence by submission to the laws of its communication, ... 553
should be an agent rather than an instrument, ... 553
not a hand-, but a power-machine, ... 553
an arrow in the hand of the Almighty, ... 553
should have enthusiasm, ... 553
should be a man of much prayer, ... 553
needs passive courage, ... 555
needs especially active courage, ... 555
should possess intelligent independence, ... 555
should be fearlessly frank of speech, . 555
influenced by the national spirit, ... 555
should impress by earnestness of physical energy, ... 556
Minister, should not be impeded by traditional rules, ... 556
should cultivate practical force, .. 555, 556
should have a better motto than 'hold the fort,' 556
should seek to fulfill in a sense 'like people like priest,' 557
his prerogative, great boldness, ... 557
his courage should come from Christ as the heart of his life, ... 557
must oppose to the skeptical dogmatism of the times the dogmatism of faith, ... 557
should have a definite body of truth by which he can stand, ... 558
should have confidence and zeal in the propagation of the truth, ... 558, 559
in what sense should preach development, ... 559
how he should preach the gospel, ... 559
enjoys the leadings of God, ... 560
the subject of God's Providential leadings, ... 561
the subject of the Spirit's leadings, ... 561, 562
must master himself if he would master others, ... 563
must master his besetting sins, ... 563
must master his intellectual powers, . 563
must submit to actual circumstances, 563
must avoid denunciation, ... 564
must not despair, ... 564
must bide his time, ... 564
is weakened by consciousness of secret sins 564, 565
should exemplify the divine law, ... 565
should manifest the presence with him of a personal Christ, ... 565
his true self must put down his false, 565
is a shepherd, ... 567
should be open-minded to receive and to communicate truth, ... 567
should avoid subterfuge, ... 567
should be hopeful and trustful, .. 567, 568
should be sympathetic, ... 568
should not regard audience 'as rows of cabbage,' 570
should recognize his hearers' needs, . 570
should adapt himself as Christ adapted himself to circumstances, ... 570, 571
should be master of spiritual diagnosis, ... 571
advantages which become his from adaptation in his preaching, ... 571, 572
should regard Bible as final standard of appeal, ... 572
his vocation sublime, ... 574
should study daily original Scriptures, 575
should cultivate the homiletic habit, 576
should cultivate the demonstrative habit, ... 576
should maintain a believing habit, 576, 577

Minister, how he may cultivate right habits, 577
himself, more than his preaching, an influence, 577
will have doubts, 578
his doubts do not affect the truth of the general Christian scheme, 578
must not put too much stress on his doubts, 579
must not preach his doubts, 579
though doubting, must work and pray, 579
must cherish a proper high-mindedness, 581
must avoid an improper high-mindedness 581, 582
should seek humility by contemplating the cross, 583
should have zeal, 584
should avoid fanaticism, 584
his zeal should possess passionate devotion, 584, 585
acquires zeal by taking Christ into heart, 585
should receive Christ for personal holiness and external influence, 585
Ministers, Christian, present demand for, 299, 300
trustees of "the faith once delivered to the saints," 558
MINISTRY, CLAIMS OF CHRISTIAN, ON YOUNG MEN IN COURSES OF PREPARATORY STUDY, 269–280
Ministry, Christian, falling off of students for, 179
oneness of race, an argument for entering, 179
importance of guarding entrance to, 259
set up by God, 270
the highest human vocation, 270, 574
call to enter it, more common than generally supposed, 271
the nature of the call to, 271
duty of seeking out candidates for, 272
thorough preparation for, requisite, 272
has its infelicities, 272, 273
compares favorably with other professions, 273
has an attractive start, 273
has an assured social position, 273
helps to a symmetrical manhood, 273–275
the agency of greatest usefulness to mankind, 275, 276
requires self-sacrifice, 276
its claim for service rests on sin and sorrow of world, 277
proffers immortal honors, 278
MINISTRY, SOURCES OF SUPPLY FOR, 281–288
Ministry, decrease of trained men entering it, 281–287
statistics showing fact, 281, 282
not counterbalanced by increase of ability among the diminished candidates, 282
Ministry, decrease of trained men entering, occurs in spite of a widespread demand for able men, 283
may be explained by the prevailing philosophy of the time, 283
may be explained by the rush for material riches, 283, 285
may be explained by the secularizing of our colleges, 284, 285
may arise from a change of view as to the divine nature of the ministry, 285
may be remedied by ministers making their calling attractive, 286
may be remedied by ministers walking worthy of their vocation, 287
may be remedied by laymen inducing suitable young men to enter it, 287, 288
may be remedied by a provision for proper training for the work, 288
may be remedied by affording student suitable help during his time of study, 288
should be made a matter of prayer, 288
MINISTRY, LACK OF STUDENTS FOR, 289–293
statistics showing number of men in, to churches, 289
statistics showing number of untrained men in, 289
statistics showing falling off in students for, 289
men of culture and promise ceasing to enter, 289, 290
strong churches ought to furnish men for, 290
Christians have been indifferent to its supply, 291
parents are not anxious that their children should enter, 291
should draw its men from the best families, 292
if more revereneed, its ranks would be fuller, 292, 293
MINISTRY, EDUCATION FOR: ITS PRINCIPLES AND ITS NECESSITY, 294–391
a divine appointment, 294, 295
requires a special education, 295
Christian, and Mosaic priesthood distinguished, 295
must be abreast of life, 296
of a past generation, ineffective now, 296
requires education because of skeptical tendencies of the day, 296
requires special discipline because of intensity of modern life, 297
requires special training because the age one of organization, 298
requires its members to be consecrated and ardent students of truth, 298, 299
training for it should be supplied by our churches, 299
parents no longer anxious that their children should enter, 299

Ministry, Education for: its dignity, 299
Archbishop Leighton on, 299
according to George Herbert, 299
Baptist, specially requires knowledge of original Scriptures, 300
MINISTRY, EDUCATION FOR, ITS IDEA AND ITS REQUISITES, 302-313
requires special educational institutions, 303
not numbers, but quality wanted, 309, 544
dearth of candidates for, explained, 319, 320
rule of admission to, narrower than that of church-membership, 440
special qualifications required for, 440
candidates for, must be 'blameless,' 440
a man is disqualified for, whose earlier sin shows traces in his present conduct, 441
a man is disqualified for, who has defied 'the powers that be,' 441
'good report' necessary to, 441
candidate for, must be, if husband at all, husband of one wife, 441
its 'three onlies,' 545, 546
the word of God, its only weapon, 545
its true success, 545
faith in Christ, its energy, 546
aided by Holy Spirit, 546
manhood a condition of success in, 548
must have power, 552
enthusiasm needed in, 553
a prophetic office, 553
for the period, spirit suitable to, 559
meets a crying want of humanity, 567
Minnesingers, their rise, 500
Miracles, not impossible or improbable, 19
MIRACLES, THE CHRISTIAN, 129-147
MIRACLES, AS ATTESTING A DIVINE REVELATION, 129-147
Miracles, Christian, furnish principal evidence for Christianity, 129
the external certification which they furnish evidential, 130
must be defended as being in the very substance of Scripture, 131
cannot be sundered from the internal evidences, 131
prove doctrine and doctrine miracles, 131
not a burden, but a support, 132
why so generally ignored, 132
defined, 132, 133
not described in Scripture as violations or suspensions of natural law, 133
do not necessarily suspend or violate natural law, 134
may be instances in which lower laws and forces in nature are transcended and merged in higher ones, 134
are possible if God be possible, 136
do they require immediate volitions of God at time of their occurrence, 136-139
'providential,' what?, 136, 137
Miracles, Christian, Babbage's theory of, 137
provided for in the original plan of nature, 137, 138
'unusual, while natural law is habitual, divine action,' 138
results of immediate divine operation, reason for preferring to regard them as, 138, 139
recurrence of, unproved, 139
if fully known to us we could not explain them, 140
are they probable? 140, 143
presumption against them on account of general uniformity of nature, 140
uniformity of nature does not render them impossible, 140, 141
principle of final cause will account for them, 141
shown to be not impossible by occurrence of geologic cataclysms, 141
probable, because physical universe exists for moral ends, 142
probable, because an exigency worthy of such an interposition has occurred, 142, 143
are they supported by sufficient evidence? 143, 144
the *petitio principii* in Hume's argument, 143, 144
can be matter of testimony like other facts, 144
their central one, the resurrection of Christ, considered in detail, 144, 145
ceased probably with first century, 145
ceased with completion of canon, 146
how distinguished from false, 146
the only miracles that rationally justify credence, 147
civilization has not destroyed belief in them, 147
Missionaries, should respect the independence of native churches, 381
are evangelists from home-churches, 382
should inculcate on native churches duty of self-support and self-propagation, 382
should have a double faith, 382
should develop native agency, 383
the character of the men who should be, 383
should serve apprenticeship, 384
should be brought home frequently, 384
should have interviews with home Committee, 384
should be amenable to discipline at at hand of executive, 384
Jesus Christ, the greatest of, 388
Missions, rest upon a conviction of the oneness of the race, 179, 373
are paralyzed by the teaching of a future larger opportunity for the heathen, 179

Missions, must follow lines of secular effort, 370
rest on a self-imparting love, 371
commenced among a lapsed Semitic race, 372
of apostles, did not overlook out-of-the-way places, 372
to barbarous Britons, 372
re-creative in their influence, 372
a century, a brief time to test them, 373
a universal devotion to, would hasten millennium, 375, 376
their present danger not enthusiasm, but self-indulgence, 375
safety of church lies in, 375
MISSIONS, ECONOMICS OF, 378-386
Missions, seventy years of American Baptist, 378
economics of, 378
should be established among degraded and weak tribes, 378
to Burmans and Karens contrasted, 379
must not overlook intellectual and refined peoples, 379
should have persistent reinforcement, 379
must be an exhibition of Christian life, 379
find a help in lack of individuality among heathen, 379
evangelization the principal branch of, 380
medical, not much needed, 380
education need not precede, 380
their converts should be gathered into churches without delay, 381
their churches, character of, 381
must not develope into episcopacy, 381
their converts not to be kept in perpetual tutelage, 382
their slow progress in France explained, 382
importance of visiting-deputations to their various fields, 385
separate fields should be assigned to individual churches, 385
are the greatest argument for Christianity, 388
are the distinctive mark of Christianity, 388
the record of, has enlarged the conception of humanity, 388
show what Christianity really is, 388, 389
based upon four fundamental doctrines, 389
Christianity is an argument for, 389
love for, connected with love to Christ, 389
our attitude to, a test of character, 389
Missions, modern theory of, founds itself on laws of civilization and progress, 369
pays little attention to commands and promises of Scripture, 369
Missions, modern theory of, would confine its efforts to the intelligent and advancing races, 369
adduces apostolic missions as planted mostly in centres of influence, 369
would confine missions to America since best races represented here, 370
an element of truth in, 370
wrong, because it would not preach gospel to every creature, 371
violates that instinct of Christian love which stoops to the weakest, 371
is opposed to the method which has been historically successful, 372
ignores the solidarity of the race, 372
contemns the elevating grace of self-abandonment, 374
contravenes the plan that gives most glory to Christ, 375
deserts the example of our Savior, 376
hesitates to cast itself absolutely upon the divine power and promise, 376
MISSIONS, THEOLOGY OF, 387-390
Moffat, Robert, his mistake as to atheism of certain African tribes, 78
Mohammedanism, to an extent a missionary religion, 388
its moral teaching, 388
Money, not, of itself, root of every evil, 461
Monism, in every form, fatal to theology, 7
is either Materialism or Pantheism, 7
false in every form, 24
adopted by Spencer, 47
its fascination for philosophic mind, 55
Mont Blanc, illustration from, 5
Moody, D. L., an example of consecration, 565
Mount of Penitence, its discipline of souls, 516, 517
Moral argument for existence of God, see Anthropological.
Moral inquiry as valid as physical research, 20
Moral feelings affirm not advantage but obligation, 53
ideas latent in mind of a child, 77
obligation, according to Spencer founded in utility or happiness, 54
quality of an action, in what it resides, according to Hopkins and Emmons, 117
Moral truth, as 'positive' as physical, 20
demonstrable by its own evidence, 20
has its place in every system of thought, 22
Morality, Christian, its rules co-incident with those of utility, 451
Morals and science, complementary, 20
Mosaic cosmogony, evolutionary, 45
Motion of matter, its source, 33
what implied in its existence, 44
evolutionary, requires co-ordinating intelligence, 44

Motive is the man, 123
Motives, by which an unregenerate person may be led to give preliminary attention to truth, 119
not causes but occasions of an action, 121, 123
free agency power to choose between, 121, 122
compounded of external presentations and internal dispositions, 122
do not determine will, 123
will obeys them, yet is active, elective, sovereign in its obedience, 123
Mozley, on the two ruling ideas concerning God, 143
Müller, Julius, his modified determinism, 122
on the attributes of God, 189
on Christ, if only human nature, necessarily sinful, 205
Mulford, Elisha, his theology tends to make God in human spirit the only cause, 167
Munger, Theodore T., his New Theology, 167
Murphy on conscience as an evidence for God, 84
Nati consumere fruges, who in Political Economy, 449
Natural Realism, Reid an advocate of, 61
Nature, adaptations in, according to Positivism, results of mechanical laws, 12
alone gives us no conception of mind or of God, 23
must be interpreted by our knowledge of mind, 24
its conquest by man, the idea of modern civilization, 24
becomes a revelation of God, if interpreted by what we find within ourselves, 29
the term defined, 132
Nature, its uniformity, not absolute and universal, 140
not a truth of reason, 141
not supported by science, 141
amenable to moral law, 142
the garment of Deity from which he can 'make bare his arm,' 390
conquered by man's obedience, 553
Naville, Ernest, on human liberty, 95
Nazareth, its prominent features, 482, 483
Neaves, Lord, his witty lines on Mill and Hume, 11
Nebular hypothesis, illustration from, 2
'Necessary, the,' and 'customary' cannot be confounded, 11
Necessary laws of mind must be assumed in the very attempt to deny them, 49
Nero, Paul's direction to obey him, how to be understood, 402
Nero, the philosophy of Nescience compared to, 8
Nescience, the philosophy of, denies direct knowledge of mind, 8
demolishes all philosophy, 8
denies existence of mind, 8
how it explains what is called 'mind,' 8
regards thought as mere cerebration, 8
looks upon religious and moral conceptions as only diseased imaginations, 8
Comte, its coryphæus, 9
its stock argument against Theism, 51
Nestorianism, nominalistic, 164
Newman, John Henry, his history affected by his idealistic notions, 7
on miracles, 138
Newton, his idea of gravitation, 33
Niger, the river, an illustration from, 16
Nile, description of, 470
Ninety and Nine, Leaving the, 368-377
usual interpretations of the parable, 368
author's interpretation, 369
Nominalism, what? 164
its two principal applications in theology, 164
atomistic, 164
as regards divine nature involves virtual tritheism, 164
conceives of the divine attributes as mere names, 164
regards mankind as a collection of individuals, 165
inconsistent with a common Fall and common Redemption, 165
Non pleni nascimur, 101
Non posse peccare, characteristic of whom, 107
Non posse non peccare, characteristic of whom, 107
Noumena, testified to by reason, 60
Oberlin "China Band," 385
Obligation founded in the moral character of God, 55
Occam, an early Nominalist, 164
'Occasional cause,' what? 92
Œdipus, his fate that also of evolution, 46
his fate an unchristian conception, 120
Olives, Mount of, its appearance, 478
Olshausen, on the word of God, 165
on divine knowing being equal to willing, 165
Omar, the Saracen Caliph, 485
Omar Khayyam, his teaching, 533
Oneness of self, origin of idea of unity in nature, 22
Onlies, The Three, 544-546
Ontological argument for existence of God, founded on abstract necessary ideas of mind, 84
is now generally abandoned, 84
its false assumption, 84

Orchids, Darwin on 'design' in arrangements for their fertilization, 12
Order, idea of, its origin, 22
Ordinances, their form significant, 247
their mutual order significant, 247
because monumental, must have form carefully preserved, 247
ORDINATION, COUNCILS OF, THEIR POWERS AND DUTIES, 259–268
Ordination, its importance, 260
of deacons, 260, 268
its preliminary stage, 260
its complementary stage, 260
the act of the local church, 260
council but assistant in, 260
may be attended to in extreme cases without or in spite of a council, 260
its nature explained, 265
certain accompaniments of, 265
import of prayer and laying-on of hands therein, 265, 266
ministers coming from other bodies should receive, 266
involves three things, 266
the public service in, its order detailed, 267
to whom should it be granted, 268
Ordination, councils of, they guard entrance of ministry, 259
called into existence by local church, 259
have advisory power only, 259
have moral influence, 259
neglect of their advice, a serious step, 260
confer no special grace, 260
help local churches to determine upon call and qualifications of candidate, 260
grant authorization to exercise gifts within denomination, 260
may have unordained members, 261
should discharge their duties most solemnly and scrupulously, 261
should be effectively constituted, 262
ministerial and lay elements in them should be properly balanced, 262
their examination of candidates should be public, 262
their deliberations subsequent to examination should be private, 262
proposed rules of procedure, 263–264
Organization, only explicable on hypothesis of an organizing force superior to matter, 34
"Orients himself," the expression alluded to, 302
Origen on 'development' in Genesis, 45
Othello's treatment of Desdemona referred to, 580
Ought, more imperative than self-interest, 54
Oung-pen-la, its influence, 374
Outness, what it is and what it supposes, 67
Overbeck's picture of the child-Christ, 202
Ox-like character, what? 396
P., impressed upon forehead of each penitent in Purgatory, 526
Palæstra of the Greeks referred to, 307
Palestine, recollections of, 474–479
method of travelling in, 474, 475
extent and accessibility of, 475
its advantageous situation, 475, 476
a sample land, 476
Mediterranean route through, 476, 477
its mountainousness, 477
objects of visiting, 479
what it was to the Crusaders, 496
Paley, utilitarian and materialistic, 5
did not sufficiently recognize divine immanence, 167
Paradise, of the *Divine Comedy*, 520–522
its description the poet's loftiest effort therein, 518, 519
its nature too elevated for popular appreciation, 519
is a state of will freed from earthly desire, 519
in it, the capacity of perfection varies, 519
its law one of upward gravitation, 519
Beatrice, Dante's guide in, 519
its outward surroundings accompaniments of character, 519
its heaven of the moon, 519
its heaven of Mercury, 520
its heaven of Venus, 520
its heaven of the Sun, 520
its heaven of Mars, 520
its heaven of Jupiter, 520
its heaven of Saturn, 520
its heaven of the Fixed Stars, 520
its heaven of the *Primum Mobile*, 520
among its privileges, a revelation of the Trinity in Unity, 520
its ruling conception, light qualified by love, 521
in it, nearness to God and service to his creatures are combined, 522
rank in, determined by strength of vision of God, 522
'The Rose of the Blessed,' its connection with the lower heavens, 522
constituted by a combination of holiness and love, 523
perfect sympathy and communion between the spirits in, 523
Parcimony, the law of, urged by Hamilton against Berkeley's views, 64
Park, Dr., of Andover, on Original Sin, 169
on Will, 169
on Atonement, 174
Παῤῥησία, its meaning enlarged on, 555
Pascal, on the mutual dependence of miracles and morals, 131
PASTOR, MENTAL QUALITIES REQUISITE TO, 566–569

Paul, by inspiration reached a point where divine sovereignty and human freedom appeared in harmony, ... 115, 116
his speech on Mars' Hill, ... 181
his designations of himself in his earlier and later epistles a mark of growth in grace, ... 210
Peabody, Ephraim, his illustration of miracle, ... 139, 140
Pelagian view of original depravity arises from a false view of will, ... 101
Pelagius, his error according to N. W. Taylor, ... 169
Penance, its three elements, ... 516
Penny, parable of, its meaning, ... 160
Perception, internal, a dual cognition, ... 43
Perfection the fundamental attribute of God, ... 51
Persian controversial maxim, ... 244
Personality, the grounds on which it is attributed to God, ... 52
consistent with the uniformity of his operations, ... 52
Peter of Picardy, ... 487
preaches crusades, ... 487
at Council of Clermont, ... 487
Peter's, St., at Rome, alluded to, ... 3, 242
Phenomena, the narrower and larger meaning of the term, ... 30
Philippians 2: 12, 13, commented on, 115–117
PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION, ... 1–18
Philosophy, at the basis of religion as a science, ... 2
answers the questions of the logical understanding as to religion, ... 3
deals with underlying facts, ... 3
analytic in its method, ... 3
it defines and correlates primary conceptions of revelation, ... 3
furnishes with scientific accuracy the facts of man's mental constitution which are required by Theology, ... 3, 4
has given Theology its logical order, ... 4
its modern contributions to religion, 5
through Theology it affects the practical life of church and nation, ... 5
its dangers are also those of religion, 5
and religion, both inclined to a vicious monism, ... 5, 6
Idealistic, its influence on John Henry Newman, ... 7
Materialistic, its influence on Joseph Priestley, ... 7
Sensational, its influence on France, ... 7
Kantian, its influence in Germany, ... 8
of Nescience, altogether antagonistic to Christianity, ... 8, 9
an impartial, essential to the perfect triumph of religion, ... 14
a true, a weapon for subduing the world to Christ, ... 14
will exist while world stands, ... 14
Philosophy, a source of discipline and strength for the preacher, ... 14
a true and false have been side by side in all ages of the world, ... 15
is now being prosecuted according to inductive methods, ... 16
a true, secured by retention of the fundamental facts of consciousness, 16
vitiated by Hamilton's doctrine of the relativity of knowledge, ... 16
finds its highest province in the interpretation and defence of the intuition of God, ... 17
of Hegel, its influence, ... 31
the Mechanical, its present influence accounted for, ... 31
the fashion of, changes, ... 31, 39, 283
false, bears relation to periods of national decadence, ... 31, 32
every false, has its modicum of truth, 32
PHILOSOPHY OF EVOLUTION, THE, ... 39–57
Philosophy, Cosmic, ... 39–57
Physical research, undue prosecution of, its influence on our age, ... 32
Physician, the proper characteristics of, ... 19
in danger of materialism, ... 20
a, who learned the divinity of Christ while praying to him on behalf of a patient, ... 211
Physicians admonished, ... 30
Piacenza, Council of, ... 487
Picture, a, not explained by an inventory of the colors which compose it, 23
Pilgrimage, its history, ... 484
Pilgrims to Holy Sepulchre, their fanaticism, ... 478
washing in Jordan, ... 478
Pisans invade Syria, ... 486
Pitti Palace, a suggestive combination of heathen and religious art in, ... 413
Poet, his three-fold function, ... 326
can only take up a department of poetry, ... 528
must show the essential truth of things, ... 528
must have a large knowledge, ... 532
must have right views of human nature, ... 532, 533
must have proper views of God, ... 533, 534
must have right views of the relations between man and God, ... 534
POETRY AND ROBERT BROWNING, ... 525–543
Poetry, a new definition of, ... 526
deals with the universe, ... 527
cannot be compassed by any one finite mind, ... 527
must idealize, ... 531–536
does not yield its full meaning to cursory perusal, ... 539
requires lucid construction, ... 537–539
requires rhythmical and musical expression, ... 541

Political Economy, its relation to Christianity, 443
what it is not, 443
includes moral influences, 443
Storch's definition of, 443
De Quincey's view of it, 443, 444
its great principles have been generally settled, 444
co-extensive with humanity, 444
it seeks to discover the methods and results of the principle of self-interest, 444
recognizes self-love as a rational principle, 444
allied to Moral Philosophy, 444
a branch of Christianity in the concrete, 445
recognizes manhood as supreme, 446
gives an honorable place to human labor, 446
is not materialistic, 447
its idea of service, 448
benevolence, inherent in, 450
a witness to Christianity, 458
not against wealth, 462
Political Economy and Christianity, connected by their innermost principles, 444
their mutual influence, 445
any apparent antagonism between them is hurtful, 445, 446
their relation one of pre-existent harmony, 446
are parts of one great system, 446
a human element in both, 446
both make man king of this lower world, 447
a social element in both, 448
both recognize men's mutual needs and interdependence, 448
both insist on value of 'service,' 449
both estimate labor according to mental and moral elements which enter into it, 449
both teach that the service of others is compatible with one's highest interests, 449
they differ mainly in their points of view and fields of activity, 450
application of their common principles to Capital and Labor, 451–457
their rules will yet regulate mankind, 456, 457
some questions to which their joint principles might be applied, 458
they give the same truths on different planes, 458
one illustrates the other, 458
stand to each other as Mosaic law to Christianity, 459
are indissolubly connected, 459
are not co-ordinate, 459
their connection illustrated by banyan-tree, 460
Polo, Marco, his travels, 500
Pompeii, frescoes of, 56
Pope, the, 'a servant of servants,' 210
Porter, his criticism of Hamilton, 62
on efficient causes subordinate to final causes, 141
Positivism, denies knowledge of human mind, 8
denies metaphysics, 8, 13
admits only a spontaneous vegetative life, 8
denies God, freedom, conscience, immortality, 8
accepted by minds of much erudition and acumen, 8
has permeated the literature of the day, 8
has effected in many cases unconsciously our theological views, 9
its coryphæus, Auguste Comte, 9
its postulate, nothing known but material phenomena, 9
denies both efficient and final causes, 10, 12
its teachings contradict consciousness, 9
its teachings invalidate all knowledge and science, 9
teaches that cause is merely regularity of sequence, 10
teaches that law is an arbitrary succession of phenomena, 10
teaches *ex nihilo omnia fiunt*, 10
denies causal judgment, 11
abolishes inductive logic, 11
immolates the intuitions, 11, 13
makes mathematical truth purely phenomenal, 11
makes morality mere matter of convention, 11
denies conscience, 11
denies purpose in universe, 11
makes biology a part of physiology, 11
relegates theology and metaphysics to the infancy of the race, 13
denies God, 13
insists on mere uniformity of nature, 13
its new cult described, 13, 14
in its crude form, rejected by Spencer, 49
Positivists, numerous, intelligent and of all shades, 8
deny purpose in universe, 11, 12
merge final causes in totality of secondary causes, 12
their inference, that supposed imperfections in design implies absence of purpose, replied to, 12
unconsciously use language which implies the adaptation they explicitly deny, 12
beg the question, 20
Posse non peccare and *posse peccare*, Augustine's formula of man's moral state in Eden, 107

Pounds, the parable of, its meaning, 161
Poverty, not required by Christianity, 461
Powell, Baden, denies the literal destruction of the world by fire, 9
Power behind phenomena, an irresistible, 11
its type and proof in the action of our will on our organism, 11
Power, has its seat in mind, 25
Power in unregenerate to avoid certain sins, 118, 119
to make himself more or less depraved, 119
to suspend evil action and give attention to considerations which urge obedience, 119
a reward of heaven, 161
Preacher, should set forth true philosophical principles, 15
and audience, their casual relations, 211
and audience, sure to meet again, 211
PREACHER'S DOUBTS, THE, 578–580
Preaching, a development of the revealed word, 545
why supposed by some to have lost its power, 551
'Prelude, the,' of Wordsworth, quoted, 17
Preservation, self-, the law of life, 191
PRESIDENT, THE DEATH OF THE, 347–357
Press, the weapon of the church, 243
Pressure, requires something that presses and something that is pressed, 43
'Priesthood, a Chronic Disorder of the Human Race,' 566
Priestley, Joseph, his philosophy affects his theology, 7
Priests more powerful and universal than kings, 77
Primogeniture, Dr. Johnson's sarcastic eulogy of, 462
Primum mobile, according to Dante, 509
Principles often assumed which on formal statement would be repudiated, 245
Probation, individual as well as racial, 119
sinner's individual, not removed by inborn character, 125
after death, its relations to New England Theology, 126
a fair one in Adam prevents inference of a further one after death, 127
individual, is of grace, 127
according to Scripture, ends with this life, 127
second, doctrine examined, 174–177
is the phrase correct? 174, 175
is the present a proper one for all? 175
rests on nominalistic individualism, 175
is neutralized only by Scripture doctrine of organic unity of race, 175
virtually denies guilt of mankind, 175
second, Scriptures oppose, 177
Production, we are bound to the utmost possible, 463
Christian, ultimately that of holiness in the earth, 463
economical, may be as extensive as you please, if subservient to religious production, 464
Productive and unproductive labor, Dr. Chalmers on, 449
Professional man, the worthy, his characteristics, 19
Professions, the three, their mutual relations. 19
learned, not now three but a dozen, 283, 284
PROFESSOR'S CHAIR, LEARNING IN THE, 344–346
Promise, the first, 391
Propagation, science recognizes more than one way of, in same species, 205
Prophesying, New Testament, what? 553
Protoplasm, its relation to life, 34
living and dead, 34
Providence, Guizot's comparison of, to Homer's gods, 390
Providence and Holy Spirit, mutually supplementary, 557
Prudens quæstio, its value in science, 82
Psalm 104, its main thought, 181
Psychical processes, their relation to physical, 46
'Psychology without a soul,' 69
Ptolemy, his astronomical views, 508
Publication Society, American Baptist, its origin, 238
based on a conviction that truth is an organic whole, 238
based on a conviction that special truths have been entrusted to the keeping of the Baptist denomination 242
based on a conviction that modern needs require modern measures, 243
the success which has attended its publications, 243
Punishment, what? 192
the impulse in, 194
never referred to love, 195
of wicked, consent of saints thereto, 195
a manifestation of self-vindicating holiness, 195
Punishment, future, alleged beneficial effects, 196, 197
Beecher on, 196
teaching of Universalists, 196, 197
Parker, Joel, on, 197
Patton, F. L., on, 197
its reason lies in divine holiness, 197
Purgatory, according to Romish doctrine, 515
according to Dante, 515
and Hell, how related in *Divine Comedy*, 516
is divided into Ante-Purgatory and Purgatory proper, 515, 516

Purgatory, a process rather than a place, 517
has clear analogies in our every-day life, 518
in the sense of a *post mortem* purification, unscriptural, 518
faith in it often leads to fatal procrastination, 518
its purifications unscripturally represented as penal, 518
Purity, what? 189
of soul, gives clear instinct of immortality, 191
Purpose in nature, denied by Comte, 26
Pyramid, the Great, ascent and entrance of, 471-473
Qualities, secondary, what? 62
primary, what? 62
Quality, Mill's definition of, 22
Quatrefages, on limited geographical distribution of Atheism, 78
Quenstedt, on the human element in Holy Scripture being due to inspiration, 148
Quincy, President of Harvard, anecdote of his opposition to co-education, 425
Quincy, Mass., educational revolution there, 426
Race, modern idea of its solidarity anticipated in Scripture, 103
according to nominalism, 165
atomistic account of, 165
realistic doctrine of, 165
a tree, 165
Adam once the race, 165
the doctrine of its oneness, an antidote to the exaggerated individualism of the day, 178
oneness of, its relation to ministry and missions, 179
Race-sin, ignored by New Theology, 166
Rangoon, prayer-meeting in heathen temple at, 279
Realism, Natural, as held by Reid, 61
as held by Sir W. Hamilton, 62
and Idealism compared, 63-71
its simplest form, 66
possesses the universal belief of mankind, 66
represents the facts of experience, 67-69
an objectionable form of, 164
its teaching on the divine attributes, 165
mediæval, 165
asserts real historical connection of race, 165
Reason, a system whose order satisfies, must have sprung from a designing intelligence, 34
Redeemed in heaven, may render service to God's creatures, 526
Reflection, what? according to Locke, 58
Regeneration, the only parallel afforded in experience to the apostasy of the Fall, 110
not a mechanical work, 125
not produced by mere moral suasion, 125
produced by Christ's entrance into soul, 125
its relation to conversion, 125
man's will active in, 125
not a miracle, 132
and union with Christ, 224
Reid, Dr. Thomas, his contention against Hume, 61
advocated 'Philosophy of Common Sense,' 61
his Natural Realism, 61
his inaccuracies, 61
his services to philosophy, 61
Sir W. Hamilton's annotations on, 62
Relativity of knowledge, consequences of doctrine of, 16
Religion, speculative and practical, 2
as it exists in mind of child and of the logian, 2
each of its sides tends to reproduce the other, 2
its debt to philosophy, 2-5
rests on philosophy, 2, 3
owes to philosophy the defining and correlating of its primary conceptions, 3-5
its relations to Scholasticism, 4
its relations to Platonism, 4
its relations to Aristotelianism, 4
its relations to modern philosophy, 4
and science, condition of their harmony, 20
and science, the truth common to both, according to Spencer, 52
what, according to Spencer, 53
not a mere sense of mystery and dependence, 53
men must have, 77
faculty of, disclosed by presence of superstition, 79
true, what it is? 224
its origin not in fears, 391
Remarriage, prohibition of, only penalty for adultery in American law, 433
of a person who has a former husband or wife living, felony in Tennessee, 433
of a woman divorced in Kentucky upheld by a Tennessee court, 433
of a woman in New York State, married in New York State, but divorced in Ohio, declared void in New York courts, 437
not permitted by Paul, even in cases of willful desertion, 438
Remarriage of guilty party to a divorce, forbidden during life-time of innocent complainant by Revised Statutes of New York State until 1879, 433

Remarriage of guilty party to a divorce, though contracted outside of New York State, declared in one case by New York courts null and void, 433
if divorce decreed in Massachusetts, though contracted outside of that State, by Statute declared null and void, 433
no express declaration in New York State Statutes that even if contracted outside of State, it is null and void 433
if valid according to laws of any State, valid in New York State, 433
dictum of Justice Johnson in Court of Appeals regarding, 435
puts the contractor under legal ban in New York State, 436
a misdemeanor in New York State but not bigamy, polygamy or adultery, 436
contractor guilty of contempt of New York courts, 436
prohibition of, has no effect outside New York State, 436
Remarriage in case of divorce on ground of adultery, permitted to innocent party, 439
that it is not permitted to guilty party an inference from the silence of Christ, 440
its permissibility to guilty party, Dr. Woolsey on, 440
of guilty party, a violation of law of Scripture and of State, 440
Remorse, more than sense of unfitness to surroundings, 53
Renan, on the Beatitudes, 415
Reparation, the desire to make, illustrations of, 216
Representative idea, Reid upon 61
'Respect the dreams of thy youth,' 19, 544
Responsibility, coextensive with our range of active being, 97
for native depravity, 101
for human nature, 101
Resurrection of Christ, the central miracle of Christianity, 144
its evidence, 145
its probative value, 145
main subject of apostolic preaching, 145
teaching of ordinances, 145
Revelation, an external, affords material for science, 75
internal and external, their connection, 172
book of, significance of fact that Scripture ends with, 363
Revolution, French, its connection with philosophical teachings, 7
Revolutions, break out from below, 488, 489
Revue Chrétienne, on will as a choice between pre-existent motives, 97
Reward, a peculiar, for each Christian worker, 160
of duty done, power to do more, 161
Rewards, are 'according to works,' 160
in what sense the same, 160
in what sense differing, 161
of heaven, what? 161
Rhine steamer and barge, illustration from, 465, 466
Richardson, the extreme sentimentality of his *Clarissa*, 536
Richter, Jean Paul, 156
Right, and wrong, reduced to conventionalism by Positivism, 11
never confounded with advantage, in language of world, 53
as a result of ancestral experiences, 53
as the adaptation of constitution to circumstances, 53
an idea not inherent in things or actions, but brought to them by the mind, 54
an intuition, 54
and wrong, knowledge of, is an original cognitive power of mind, 77
binds because it is the nature of God, 197
its full significance known only at the the judgment, 197
Righteousness, the supreme attribute in man, 195
'Ring and the Book,' quotation from, 36
its subject described, 529–531
its method defended, 538, 539
Ritual of divine appointment, profoundly spiritual, 247
Robertson, F. W., on the make up of truth, 5, 6
his compassion for the sincere doubter, 23
his impatience with self-complacent infidelity, 23
on the folly of attempting the reconciliation of truths which though apparently contradictory are yet both true, 115
on the doubt of God's personality being more terrible than that of one's immortality, 186
Robinson, Dr., his anecdote of a mother's consecration of her boy to the ministry, 291, 292
Rochester, N. Y., a city of revivals, 387
Rochester Theological Seminary, its curriculum described, 305, 306
addresses to graduating classes at, 544–586
author's address on occasion of graduation of his first theological class at, 546–548
allusion to its first quarter of a century of existence, 554
Rockefeller Hall, its dedication, 302
Rome, as depicted in Revelation, 358
Roscelin, a mediæval nominalist, 164

'Rose of the Blessed,' according to Dante, 509
Rossetti, Miss F. M., her "Shadow of Dante," 501, 506
Rothe, his conception of the divine attributes, 164
Royce, an American Hegelian, 61
Safford, Daniel, his idea of benevolence, 464
Sakkara, Apis-cemetery at, 470
Salvation, entirely of God, 103, 104
Indian's view of, 105
Arminian view of, 105
man's ability in, from God, 113
recognition of God's working in, tends to practical religion, 117
limitations of divine agency in, 117
Samaritan Pentateuch, 482
Samuel, Second, 2 : 23, 347
Saracenic, invasion of Europe, 485
civilization threatened Europe, 485
Satan, Milton's and Dante's conceptions of, compared, 513
Savings-Banks, an accompaniment of civilization, 462
Schelling, his view of human knowledge, 8
held a direct intuition of self and God, 60
how his system differs from Fichte's, 60
Scholasticism, its influence on Theology, 4
Schools, large, their advantages and disadvantages, 429
Schopenhauer, a valuable contributor to facts of man's nature, 97
Science, what it is, 9
a pre-equipment of mind necessary to, 9
involves mind as well as matter, 9
ideas as well as facts essential to, 10
larger than observation and classification, 20
its terms derive value from metaphysics, 21
has, according to Spencer, a truth in common with religion, 52
assumes order and useful collocation in the universe, 82
faith at basis of all science, 88
how related to religion, 459
Scriptures, Holy, place of reason in relation to, 572–574
Sects, their place in the dissemination of truth, 241, 242
Selenology, the assumed science of, on what dependent? 75
Self, its cognition necessary to the idea of unity in mental phenomena, 68
Self-consciousness, a valid source of knowledge, 20
the nature and value of its testimony to existence of the ego, 68
Self-denial, its reflex influence on church, 374
moves the heart of God, 376
Self-interest, the fundamental law of Political Economy, 444
has its morals, 444
its relation to universal benevolence, 444, 445
Bascom on, 459
man's highest, often at war with lower principles, 458
man's highest, its attainment requires a power outside human nature, 459
Selfishness, not the best policy, 456, 457
Self-limitation of God, in design and creation, 12
makes knowledge of him possible, 51
as to his moral nature, the completest, 51, 76
imposed only from within, 76
in the person of Christ, 186
Self-love, its place in Christianity and Political Economy, 450, 451
SELF-MASTERY, 562–566
Seljuks, conquest of Palestine by, 488
treatment of Christian pilgrims by, 488
Seminary, Theological, its site should be a large city, 298, 311
should be liberally supported by the churches, 301
what its departments should be, 303, 304
requires the ablest instructors possible, 304
Seminaries of Hamilton and Rochester, their relations, 314
Seminary, Theological, the salaries of its professors, 305
should be a store-house of literature, 306
should have a library, museum, and lectureships, 306
training of the vocal organs should be a part of its course, 307
support of students at, 307, 308
relations between its professors and students, 310, 311, 318
its chapel services, 312
its influences most permanent, 313
trains leaders for the churches, 316
must not become a kindergarten, 316
should combine practical with theoretical teaching, 317
should insist on highest and widest culture, 318
seeks to ground in the revealed word, 545
its educators do not require servile acquiescence in their instructions, 547
the twofold aim of its discipline, 547
seeks to develop habits of earnest, independent investigation, 547
seeks to encourage a spirit of love, 547
should not cultivate the intellect exclusively, 547
its teaching should set forth a definite body of truth, 558
Seneca, on innate depravity, 101
Sensations, Berkeley's view of, 58

Sensations, may be caused by God directly, 58
only objects of knowledge, 58
only deal with points in external material, mind cognizes substance, 68
Sensation proper, according to Hamilton, 62
Sensational school, French, Locke's relation to. 58
Sensationalism of Locke, its outcome, 7
Sensationalism, rhetorical, 571
its cure, 571
Sense-experiences of past generations the alleged source of *a priori* ideas, 49
Sense-perception, according to Kant, 60
Sentimentality, its definition by Mill, 536
Separation of an illegally married pair not always expedient, 440
Sepulchre, Church of Holy, scene at, on Good Friday, 478
description of, 479
'Service,' its place in Political Economy, 448
Seth, a Hegelian, 61
"Seven 'Togethers,'" 234
Shakespeare, on complementary relation of the sexes, 204
hides his personality in his dramas, 527
Shelley, his musical expression, 541
Shepherd, good, Christ as, painted on communion-cups and walls of catacombs, 368
Signality, the determining feature of miracles, 138
Simony, its future punishment according to Dante, 512
Sin, according to Hegelianism, 61
Romish view of, 102
its origin discussed, 108–111
its source, an evil disposition, 111
racial as well as personal, 124
self-isolating, 217
contemptible, the teaching of the symbolism of the *Divine Comedy*, 513
self-perversion of will, according to Dante, 513
its future penalty, according to Dante, not essentially external to the sufferer, 514
according to Dante, tends to permanence, 514, 575
Sinful nature, why man is responsible for, 118
'Sinner, the,' why? 158
Sins, of each individual peculiar to the transgressor, 257
their three-fold division according to Dante, 511
seven capital, 516
SKEPTICISM, MATERIALISTIC, 31–38
Skepticism, modern, its drift and character, 29, 31
Smith, Adam, taught Political Economy in connection with Moral Science, 443
Smith, Adam, the founder of the science of Political Economy, 443
Smith, Goldwin, on the automatic theory of human nature, 27, 28
Smith, H. B., on causes, 92
Smith, Sydney, his witticism on Berkeley and Hume, 59
his opinion on the difference between men and women, 403
Smyth, Dr. Newman, on a fair probation either in a pre-existent state or after death, 127
Social questions, the problems of the present, 452
Social Unions, their best functions, 461
Solipsism, Idealism logically leads to, 169
Son of man, the term implies more than humanity, 206
'Song of Moses and the Lamb,' why the redeemed sing, 365
Sorcery, its future punishment according to Dante, 512
Soul, what in opinion of Humist, 50
present in every part of body at once, 51
a mental image of, impossible, 51
as defined by Berkeley, 59
God can work in, 152
Southern cross, according to Dante, shines on Mount of Penitence, 515
Sovereignty, divine, and human freedom, both facts, though irreconcilable by our powers, 6
Space an *a priori* truth, cannot be figured to the imagination, 48, 51
Speculation, however lofty, filters down to the people, 5, 55
Spencer, Herbert, advocate of philosophy of Nescience, 8
materialistic in his philosophy, 31
his one postulate, the persistence of force, 40
his vicious use of *a priori* reasoning, 41
does not regard force as connected with will, 42
is logically an Absolute Idealist, 43
sets forth a method of the divine working, 44
ignores or denies important facts, 44
fails to explain origin of life and mind 44, 45
deserves thanks for emphasizing truth of development in creation, 45
regards universe as consisting only of one substance, 47
his theory of knowledge unsatisfactory, 47, 48, 49
not a Positivist, 49
recognizes *a priori* elements in human knowledge, 49
the origin he assigns to *a priori* elements, 49
makes cognition to be recognition, 49

Spencer, Herbert, his explanation of existence of intuitions, 50
a materialistic idealist, 50
a Humist, 50, 59
declares God to be inconceivable and unknown, 50
his idea of 'conceive,' 50, 51
on the absolute and Infinite as unknown, 50
attacks personality of God, 52
on the truth which is common to religion and science, 52, 53
his explanation of the existence of the feeling of obligation, 53, 54
makes an action right *because* useful, 54, 55
what he considers conscience as, 55
regards the will as externally necessitated, 55
is a monist, 55
his system delusively simple, 55
his teaching acceptable to those who dread a personal, holy God, 55
his teaching destructive to morality, art and literature, 56
his system open to a *reductio ad absurdum*, 58
on the cognition of self, 70
his explanation of idea of God, 87
on advantages of varied environment, 428
his *dictum* of style, 537
Spending and giving, a test of character, 467
Spinoza, on design implying imperfection in designer, 12
Spirit, Holy, some of his influences may be resisted, 128
some of his influences sufficient to secure acceptance of Christ, 128
helps us to think ourselves into God's thoughts, 254
helps to believing utterance of truth, 254
communicates contagious zeal, 255
associates laborer in sympathy with God's heart, 255
grants matter and manner of speech, 255, 256
his stimulation healthy, 256
makes the teacher a magnet, 256
uses agents sometimes unconsciously, 256
bestowed by the Savior in recompense for his sufferings, 257
from him who receives him he in turn flows forth to others, 257
his ordinary illumination of believers, its relation to proper Inspiration, 170
makes us understand truth, 171
he revives and applies a past revelation, 172
turns the outer into an inner word, 172
is the organ of internal revelation, 172, 251
his office must not be exalted at expense of work of Christ, 172
every true teacher his assistant, 250
Spirit, Holy, brings spiritual blessing to the true teacher, 251
is not the invisible presence of Christ, 251
as sunlight on a darkened landscape, 251
as oculist who removes cataract, 251
in him is the returning activity of the Godhead, 252
is necessary to God himself, 252
manifests the secrets of eternity, 252
an inexhaustible reservoir always available, 253
sensitizes the heart, 253
Spoils-system, Garfield's assassination due to, 352
the system explained, 352
its unwholesome influence, 352, 353
its operation at New York Custom House, 352
its wide extent, 353
occupies unduly the time of President and Cabinet, 353
defended by Garfield as Republican nominee, 353, 354
Garfield, as President, carries it out, 354
its monstrosity will secure its abandonment, 356
State, the individual's relation to, according to modern view, 207
should leave trade and commerce alone, 450
Stephen, the protomartyr, first philosophic historian, 337
Stoics, 15
Strikes, wholesome change of feeling in relation to, 454, 455
Stuart, Moses, his influence on Bible study, 331
Substance, an *a priori* truth, 48
cognized by mind, 60
known to God and man, 60
its cognition necessary to idea of unity in material phenomena, 68
material, its cognition as inevitable an act of reason as the cognition of mental substance or conscious self, 68
Suicide, its future punishment according to Dante, 512
Superintendence of universe, God's, 46
God's, its existence and nature set forth by facts of creation, 46, 47
Support of theological students vindicated, 308
Sweden, progress of Baptist principles in, 243
Swinburne, Algernon, his sensuous paganism, 56
deifies the body, 536
Swiss valley, illustration from incident in, 376, 377
Sword, Edenic, a manifestation of wrath, 392
Sychar, a Sunday at, 482

Sympathy, not a sufficient explanation of man's responsibility for Adam's sin, 118
its nature, 568
its excellencies, 569
Synergism, unscriptural, 105
denied by Paul, 117
Synthetic conception, what? 60
Systems, delusive sometimes through superficial simplicity, 6
may become simple through mutilation, 6

Tabula rasa, mind at first is not a, 101
Tahiti, Ellis on the condition of woman there, 44
Taine, his materialistic tendency, 31
Tait, on the impossibility of *a priori* reasoning demonstrating any physical fact, 40, 41
Talbot, on metaphysics dealing with realities, 283
Tandem-team idea of salvation, unscriptural, 117
Tastes, God cares for them, 465
Taylor, Isaac, on the influence of their physical surroundings on the authors of the Bible, 476
Taylor, N. W., on Imputation, 169
on Depravity, 169
on Sin, 169
on Will, 169
on Pelagius, 169
TEACHER'S, THE, GUIDE AND HELPER, 250–258
Teacher, the true, a helper of the Spirit, 250
dependent on Spirit as organ of internal revelation, 251
dependent on Spirit as refluent movement of divine activity, 252
dependent on Spirit to render heart of auditor sensitive, 253
dependent on Spirit for a life which may incarnate the truth, 254
dependent on Spirit for emotional intensity, 254, 255
dependent on Spirit for union with God 255
dependent on Spirit for what he shall speak, 255
dependent on Spirit for how he shall speak, 255
dependent on Spirit for when he shall speak, 255
the true, receives the Spirit from Christ 257
by an act of surrender and faith, 257
to make him a blessing to others, 257
Teacher, in a theological school, why ordained? 324
of New Testament Language and Interpretation, should teach thoroughly, 325
should arrive at fixed opinions on difficult questions, 325
should cultivate breadth, 325
Teacher, of N. T. Exegesis, should exhibit boldness, 326
should cherish independence, 327
should be earnest, 327
should be reverent, 328
should be lovingly studious of God's word, 328
Teaching truth, as the scattering of perfumes in a triumphal progress, 250
Teleological argument for the existence of God, 81, 82
more carefully stated, 82
invalidity of common objections to, 82
its exact value, 83
its limitations, 83
Telescope, as an illustration, 69
Tennyson, Lord, 21, 28, 28, 30, 38, 204, 204
his portrait, 525
is he a religious poet? 535
compared with Browning, 535
Theism, the stock objection of the philosophy of Nescience to, 51
THEISM, SCIENTIFIC, 75–89
Theism, Scientific, possible, 75
its assumptions possible, 86
Theodoric, 17
Theologic thought like a pendulum, 6
Theological education, its true idea, 302
Theological students, their support should be by gift not loan, 309
should be regulated by their manifested activity intellectually and morally, 309
Theological students, why thought irreverent? 312
Theology, its beginnings, 3
combines facts of revelation and facts of consciousness, 3
how far it gets its facts from philosophy, 3
synthetic in its methods, 3
knowledge of its history requires some study of philosophy, 5
contains factors logically irreconcilable, 6
Theology and Philosophy, their different methods, 3
their mutual influence evidenced in state of modern Continental thought, 8
Theology, Comte's view of, 13
its relation to Revelation, 75
THEOLOGY, THE WILL IN, 90–113
Theology, the two principal applications of Nominalism in, 164
THEOLOGY, THE NEW, 164–179
Theology, The New, exaggerates individualism, 164
its historical connections, 164-170
has a source in mediæval nominalism, 164
nominalistic, 164
false by defect, 166
creatian, 166

Theology, the New, atomistic, 166
has a source in modern Idealism, 166
is indebted to Jonathan Edwards, 167
exaggerates the divine immanence, 167
its prominent specific ideas, 170–177
borrows from many but related schools, 170
its doctrine of Christian consciousness, 170
its practical results, 178, 179
its teachings affect family life, 178
tends to rationalism rather than mysticism, 172
has emphasized the Spirit's work, 172
its doctrine of the extra-temporal Christ, 172–174
emphasizes a valuable truth, 173
obscures the historic Christ, 173
obscures the objective Atonement, 173, 174
its doctrine of second probation, 174–177
teaches that sin consists in sinning, 175
teaches that dispositions are only sinful as leading to sin, 175
weakens our convictions of guilt of heathen, 176
its teachings affect church-life, 178, 179
loses some sublime conceptions, 179
its influence on ministry, 179
its influence on missions, 179
Theology, New England, its teachers, 169
rejects exercise-system, 169
becomes unmitigatedly individualistic, 169
its tendency, 170
Theology, Historical, its two branches, 304
Pastoral, a part of a Theological Seminary training, 304
Practical, a part of a Theological Seminary training, 304
Systematic, a part of a Theological Seminary training, 304
Theology, at present acquiring a wholesome realistic spirit, 445
is insisting on analogy between natural and moral law, 445
Theology, Scholastic, a sign of what? 497
"Things are only thoughts," a Berkeleian aphorism, 61
"Thinking thinks," Hegel's dictum, 61, 70
Thomasius, on God as "the simply one," 165
on nominalism in Theology, 165
on the divine attributes, 165, 189
Thompson, Sir William, his theory of the introduction of life to this planet, 46
Thorwaldsen, his group, "Christ and His Apostles," 233
"Thou art," inscription on Temple at Delphi, 4
Thought, in philosophy of Nescience, what? 8, 13
Thought, a true system of, recognizes the existence of metaphysical and moral truth, 20
its monistic tendency towards Idealism or Materialism, 23
not a mode of motion, 46
Tieck on Dante, 523
Time, an *a priori* truth, 48
"Time, Death and Judgment," a painting by Watts, 525
Titus, his treatment of Jerusalem, 484
Τὸ ἁπλῶς ἕν, God is not, 165
Toplady's hymn on Christ's substitution, 219
Totus in omni parte, 51
Tourmaline, the, illustration from its polarization of light, 446
Tours, defeat of Saracens at, 485
Trade, rests on law of reciprocal benefit, 450
Trades-unions and similar combinations, what objectionable in, 454
Trench, Archbishop, on "Providential Miracles," 136
Troubadours, their rise, 500
Truth in solution, tends to crystallize, 2
Truth, often consists of two opposite propositions, not in their *via media*, 6
in Theology, contains the true but irreconcilable factors of divine sovereignty and human freedom, 6
in consciousness, involves in one duality two different things, matter and spirit, 6
sacrificed, if either of its factors ignored, 6–8
absolute, denied by Positivism, 11
a globe with two opposite poles, 23
an organic whole, 239
cannot deny any part of, with impunity, 239
Baptist tenets are part of, 239
special parts of, committed to special keepers, 241
two possible plans of its dissemination, 241
in spiritual things defined, 547
influence of clearer views of, 546, 547
and love, consistent and inseparable, 547
Truth and Love, 546–548
Tyndall, his materialism, 31
on "the passage from the physics of the brain to the facts of consciousness," 36
a Humist, 59
on scientific imagination, 28
Tyrian Ladder, its ascent, 477
Ulysses, his fate according to Dante, 508
Unbelief, a stream of many eddies, 31
Unconscious Assumptions of Communion Polemics, 245–249
Uniformitarian theory of geology, recently modified, 141
Uniformity of Nature, see Nature.

Union with Christ, The Believer's, 220–225
Union with Christ, believer's, has received little formal treatment, 220
its neglect a reaction from exaggerations of mysticism, 220
is taught variously and abundantly in Scripture, 220
illustrations of, 220
direct teachings of, 221
its scientific definition difficult, 221
is a fact of life, 221
a stage in the approximation of God to his creatures, 221
not a mere natural union, 221
not a mere moral union, 221
does not destroy distinct subsistence of either of the persons united, 221
is not mediated by sacraments, 221
as described in Scripture, 222
a union of soul with Christ, 222
represented by union of building and foundation, 220
of husband and wife, 220
of vine and branches, 220
of members with human body, 220
of race with Adam, 220, 221
differs from God's natural and providential concurrence with all spirits, 222
differs from unions of mere association and sympathy, 222
differs from mere moral unions, 222
is a union of life, 222
preserves personality, 222
secures the energy of the Spirit of Christ, 222
is organic, 222
secures reciprocity in the parts of the organism, 222
is a vital union, 222
is indissoluble, 222
sacraments presuppose it, 222
is inscrutable, 222
in what sense mystical, 222
possessed by all believers, 222
not consciously possessed by all believers, 222
its knowledge sometimes acquired inadvertently, 222
knowledge of it as a personal privilege elevates Christian life, 223
is the focus of theology, 223
explains our relation to Adam, 223
throws light on the Atonement, 223
secures believer's subjective reconciliation to God, 223
makes justification more than a mere legal formality, 223
Luther on, 223
frees the Imputation of Christ's righteousness from arbitrariness, 224
is the essence of religion, 224
its relation to Regeneration, 224
Union with Christ, believer's, is cheering, 224
is purifying, 224
enables believer to appropriate prophecies and promises primarily referring to Christ, 224
assists believer to reproduce Christ's life, 224
involves fellowship with the Savior, 224
sanctifies the soul, 224
purifies and raises up the body, 224
by it Christ gives his life to the church, 224
conveys assurance of salvation, 224
communicates courage, 224
removes indolence, 224
checks alike impatience and faithless activity, 224
assists in prayer, 225
sets forth the religion which can save humanity, 225
the central truth of all theology and religion, 362, 548
the source of a minister's courage, 557
Unitarians, their view of the absolute simplicity of God, its results, 183
many advocate the eternity of matter, 183
tend to Pantheism, 183
Unity, an unregulated passion for, deprecated, 6
in mental and material phenomena, how found, 68
Universalia in re, true though not independent realities, 164
Universe, the, from the Positive position, 11
denial of purpose in, 11, 12
can produce a Comte but cannot equal his intelligence, 12
a godless, any superstition better than such a conception, 28
"a thought of God," 29
contains an idea, 33
an expression of mind, 34
of one substance, according to Spencer, 47
seeming imperfections in its order, discussed, 82, 83
its broadest signification given to the word, 527
Universities, mediæval, revival of learning in, 500
University, the, ever hospitable to ideas, 39
a teacher of philosophy, 39
Unpicturable things, many, are true, 51
Unregenerate, certain remnants of power lingering with, 118, 119
ὑπομενή, its meaning enlarged on, 555
Usefulness, each Christian has his special department of, 160
Utile, Cicero on, 55

Valedictory words to various classes graduating from Rochester Theological Seminary, ... 546, 548, 551, 554, 557, 559, 560, 562, 566, 569, 572, 575, 577, 580, 583, 586
Value, lies in labor constituting a "service," ... 448
Values, other than material in Political Economy, ... 449
Vedder, Elihu, his illustrations of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyat*, ... 533
Veitch, on Non-Egotistical Idealism, ... 67
on the intelligibility of externality of object, ... 67
Venus de' Medici described, ... 413
Violence, its future punishment according to Dante, ... 512
Virgil, what he represents in *Divine Comedy*, ... 507, 508
Virgin, house of, its translation from Jerusalem to Rome, ... 482, 483
Vita Nuova of Dante, ... 503
Vitry, James of, his typical ignorance of foreign lands, ... 500
Volition, conscious, is it necessary to sin? ... 101, 102
Voltaire, his explanation of the presence of fossils, ... 148
on influence of Purgatory, ... 525
Wallace, on difference between human and animal intelligence, ... 46
War, the hope of the feudal dependant, 490
not waged from mere desire of vengeance, ... 491
Watts, George Frederick, a very realistic painter, ... 525
his collection of pictures at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, ... 525
'We are born in faith,' Fichte's aphorism, ... 21
Wealth, its trials, ... 461
Webster, Daniel, on "room high up," ... 282
Weeping at the grave, Jewish custom of, ... 477
Wellington, on "the finger of Providence," ... 29
West Point, why quality of students at present deteriorating there, ... 292
Whately, Richard, on a professorship of Political Economy in each theological school, ... 443
Whedon, on God's making himself happy in wrong, ... 106
Whispering-gallery, illustration from, ... 551
'White Rose' of highest heaven, the resting-place of those who at the same time are working in the subordinate heavens, ... 522
Wiberg, Andreas, his usefulness in Sweden, ... 243
Will, personal, superior to nature's laws, 25
only key to interpretation of nature, ... 25, 26
Will, the results of denying its freedom, ... 36, 37
infinite, need not manifest its whole power, ... 43
infinite, alone necessarily persists, ... 43
WILL, THE, IN THEOLOGY, ... 90–113
Will, the difficulty of discussions concerning, ... 90
facts regarding, ... 91
what facts enter into the liberty of, ... 91
the liberty of, shown in mental energy specially, ... 91
its freedom held by Calvin, ... 92
requires some reason for its activity, 92
requires motive, ... 93
its liberty not dependent on indeterminateness, ... 93
its motives within mind, ... 93
its strongest motive, the ruling preference, ... 93
its completer definition, ... 94
its freedom consistent with fixed direction and form of its volitions, ... 94
its freedom compatible with certainty of action, ... 95
as a faculty of volitions is *causa causans*, ... 95
as related to character is *causa causata*, ... 95
its formal freedom, ... 95
the origin of its necessity of evil, ... 95
its civil freedom, ... 95
as treated in most moral philosophies, 95
has no power to change character, ... 96
cannot disregard motive, ... 96
errors of philosophers regarding, ... 96
a more comprehensive definition of, 96, 97
its place in the universe according to Schopenhauer and Hartmann, ... 97
unconscious, ... 97
further defined, ... 97
Revue Chrétienne on ... 97
not a 'creative first cause,' ... 97
author's theory of, required by a true doctrine of divine foreknowledge, ... 98, 101
author's theory of, required by a true doctrine of man's responsibility for native depravity, ... 101–103
author's theory of, recapitulated and tested by Scripture, ... 98–113
caprice-theory of, ... 99–101
author's theory of, necessary to a Scriptural sense of the universality of personal guilt, ... 102
author's theory of, necessary to a just view of the extent of the divine law, ... 102
how responsible for an inborn state of, ... 103
author's theory of, harmonizes with Scriptural teachings on the divine initiative in salvation, ... 103

Will, author's view of, agreeable with Scripture teaching on the permanence of character in God and the redeemed, 105–107
author's view of, defined from objection, 107–111
its motives never equally balanced, 107
may remain same while vast subordinate improvements take place in character, 111, 112
Jonathan Edwards' theory of, insufficient, 120
always and everywhere acts only in view of motives, 122
as related to motive, 122
its own determiner, 122
considered as absolutely originating, 123
obedient yet elective, 123
an undetermined cause, 123
chooses direction only, 123
and desire, how related, 123
sinners have not lost all natural power of, 124
its natural freedom under grace becomes a higher freedom, 126
its 'formal' and 'real' freedom, 126
use of its 'formal' freedom may lead to 'real' freedom, 126
may use its formal freedom till habit is incurable, 126
human, can act on nature and produce results which nature alone could not accomplish, 134
human, not determined by natural law, 135
has a power superior to nature's laws, 135
the central fact in personality, human and divine, 182
an independent, granted by God to man, 360
strongest thing in being, save God, 550
Withered hand, a parable of salvation, 113
Woman, modern view of her dignity, 207
WOMAN'S PLACE AND WORK, 400–409
Woman, her place and work according to Gen. 2: 18, 400
her paradisaic state, 400
how received by Adam, 400
in her nature equal with man, 400
in office subordinate to man, 401
one with man in life and work, 401
her head is man, as Christ's head is God, 401
her position not determined by curse, 401
divine curse upon, what does it mean? 402
her degradation among Hindus and Jews, 402
any existing relics of injustice to her in laws or manners should be put away, 402
facilities of culture should be as free to her as to man, 403
all suitable occupations should be open to, 403
Woman, her remuneration should be equal to that of man, 403
reform in all things injuriously affecting, has sympathy of Christian teacher, 403
any prominent, entitled to fair judgment, 403
by sex, subordinated in office to man, 403
her subordination to man not explained on force theory, 404
fitted by constitution for subordination, 404
the duties of maternity preclude at times outdoor labor, 405
her grandest work, 405
the influence of Christianity and civilization upon her position, 405, 406
the aspirations of the Buddhist, 406
false views of her position affect the marriage bond, 406
and the franchise, 407, 408
her debt to Christianity, 409
how she may be man's helper, 409
how much she owes to Christ, 410, 414
her position in the east, 410
at Athens and Rome, 410, 411
in heathen lands, 411, 412
her degradation self-perpetuating, 412
her nature consecrated by the maternity of Jesus, 413
her status elevated by her share equally with man in the redeeming work of Christ, 413
honored by being made the first herald of the gospel, 413
Teutonic reverence for, received new impulse from Christianity, 414
the passive virtues, usually deemed feminine, specially recognized by Christ, 414
her work for women in heathen lands a modern feature in Christian activity, 415
WOMAN, THE EDUCATION OF A, 418–430
Woman's Rights agitation, its fundamental error, 405
reasons for solicitude concerning, 407
Women, heathen, their numbers and condition, 412
elevated by Christ, 413
Christian, can to some extent repay their debt to Christ by seeking to extend the blessings they have received to their sisters, 415
not accessible to men, in some eastern countries, 416
heathen, their influence as wives and mothers, 416
Mohammedans anxious for the education of their, 416
their future missionary movements forecast, 417
the writings of, their characteristics, 420

Women, eminent public, are exceptions not examples, 429
Women's American Baptist Missionary Society, its special work, 416
its strength in 1883, 416
an opportunity for women to take part directly in mission work, 417
Woolman, John, his sympathetic sufferings as a member of a sinful race, 217
Word, the spoken, its explanation more than a reference to vibrations of air which constitute sound, 33
of God, its personality, 545
the only weapon of the Christian ministry, 545
relation of reason to, 572
Wordsworth, his poetry contrasted with that of Swinburne, 56
his lines contrasting the fixity of the material universe with the errancy of spirit, 60
Wordsworth, compared with Browning, 582
deficient in a sense of the ludicrous, 537
sometimes long-winded and wearisome, 537
WORK AND POWER, 552-554
Wundt, and his new German psychology, 69
Xenophon's saying concerning Cyrus, 564
Youmans, his theory that so-called chemical elements are but modifications of a common ultimate substance, 6
on transformation of force into consciousness, 24
ZEAL FOR CHRIST, 583-586
Zeal distinguished from fanaticism, 584
Zenana work, what? 416
its advantages, 416
whom to be done by, 416
Zola, his literary work characterized, 531

DATE DUE

FACULTY

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01235 7416